

To promote the interest of Reserve officers in the Marine Corps and the interest of the Marine Corps in its Reserve officers.

To speak for Reserve officers before the committees of Congress on matters affecting the corps, particularly in relation to personnel legislation.

To represent and assist individual members at Marine Corps headquarters; and, at all times—

To promote the interests of the Marine Corps to the end that it may best advance the welfare and serve the security of the United States.

In the past when the Reserve program was in its infancy, MCROA—

Induced the corps to prepare a Reserve training program.

Obtained from Congress sufficient funds for training.

Increased training funds by yearly pleas to Congress.

Succeeded in having standards adopted for Reserve commissions.

Fought for and got wartime disability retirement for Reserves.

Managed, in time, to insist upon and get a uniform promotion system.

Initiated, sponsored, and obtained passage of a new basic Reserve law.

In the present, MCROA has continued liaison with HQMC and also—

Called for interservice cooperation and understanding, first among the Reserve associations, at its January 29, 1949, national conference in Chicago.

Continued its fight of 1932 against the enemies of the corps in helping beat down the original form of the Unification Act, subsequently amended.

Triumphed in its demands that consolidation directive No. 1, the Reserve "gag rule," be rescinded by the Department of Defense.

Succeeded in having its voice heard in Congress in recent efforts to amend the Tydings bill and have adequate safeguards given the corps.

Publicized and backed the slogan "6 percent for security," and worked closely with 55 Representatives and 4 Senators in having bills introduced to assure the corps of always having a minimum of 6 percent of total armed force personnel strength.

Arranged to have the two flag raising portrayed in the Inauguration Day parade and in other float parades across the country.

Stood alone in resisting "merger" of all reserve officer associations and is today only one standing alone but working cooperatively with ROA.

Successfully persuaded Congress to pass nondisability reserve retirement act after many years of effort, helping sponsor VTU program.

Pointed out to Congress necessity of reserve disability retirement and testified at length on pay bill as it concerned reserves.

Submitted yearly items for Reserve Policy Board agenda, sat on boards.

Intends to see that country does not forget November 10 birthday.

Is sponsoring a new Reserve Act, giving reserves complete parity with regulars.

Continues the fight against any budget cuts in the corps that are considered disproportionate to funds allotted other services, and hopes Marine Reserve officers will help win today's battles by joining.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, September 26, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 23 (legislative day of September 3), 1949:

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR ASIA AND THE FAR EAST

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of the Philippines, to be the representative of the United States of America to the fifth session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT

John C. Pickett, of Wyoming, to be judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit, to fill a new position.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. James V. Allred, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Texas, to fill a new position.

Ben C. Connally, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the southern district of Texas, to fill a new position.

James M. Carter, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, to fill a new position.

Harry C. Westover, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, to fill a new position.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 23 (legislative day of September 3, 1949):

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Joseph H. Lyons, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 19, with headquarters at Mobile, Ala.

Wesley R. Wirtz, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La.

POSTMASTER CALIFORNIA

William E. Krenning, San Diego.

SENATE

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1949

(Legislative day of Saturday, September 3, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as toils and turmoils testing our jaded spirits wait with each day's duty, we bless Thy name that at noontide stand these gates of peace that open to a holy shrine of prayer. In a world that lieth in darkness, swept by fitful winds of despair and doubt, we pause at this sheltered sanctuary of Thy grace to make sure that the light within is not dimmed. In this desperate hour when the world's hope of a bright tomorrow is committed to our frail hands, join us to the great company of unconquered spirits who in evil times have preserved the heritage of man's best and whose flaming faith has made their lives

as lighted windows amid the encircling gloom. We ask it in the ever-blessed name of that One who is the Light of the World. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 23, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (H. R. 1746) to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide for the conveyance of land to the Norfolk County Trust Co., in Stoughton, Mass.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5895) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. KEE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. EATON, and Mr. VORYS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Myers
Bridges	Jenner	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Chapman	Kem	Robertson
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cordon	Knowland	Schoeppel
Donnell	Langer	Smith, Maine
Downey	Leahy	Sparkman
Eaton	Lodge	Stennis
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Tobey
Gillette	McKellar	Vandenberg
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Gurney	Malone	Wherry
Hayden	Martin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hoey	Millikin	Young

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on public business. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EAST-

LAND], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business with leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

MILITARY AND GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' PAY BILLS—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, September 26, 1949.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The Senate now has under consideration the armed services pay bill and, I understand, expects soon to consider the bills to revise the salary scales of the civilian officers and employees of the Government. I am glad that the Senate is taking up this much needed legislation. However, I have been surprised at some of the reports I have heard concerning objections that are being raised to these bills, particularly as they relate to revision of the salaries of officials holding key executive positions.

This is a matter of such great personal concern to me that I want to take this means of asking the Senate to consider this legislation particularly from my point of view. As I have said many times, the efficient administration of the executive branch of the Government requires well-qualified people for important positions. Because of the inadequate salaries provided for these positions, it has become increasingly difficult for me to get and keep such people. The passage of the legislation now pending in the Senate will help the situation materially. Unless it is passed, my difficulties will be

greatly increased. The relatively small cost of this legislation will be repaid many times over in improved efficiency in the operation of the Government.

I have heard that objections are being raised to the executive pay bill on the ground that some of the proposed increases are too high in terms of percentage of the present salaries for the positions involved. The fact is that the proposed salaries are very modest in relation to the responsibilities of these positions. If they appear to be high in relation to the present salaries, that is because the present salaries are ridiculously low. As I recently pointed out, the 15 top executives of a single private corporation in this country are paid more than the aggregate salary now paid to all the 250 or so Federal officers to whom this bill applies.

I have also pointed out that these officers have been passed over time and again when the Congress made adjustments in the compensation of other officers and employees. Senators and Representatives have increased their own compensation by more than 100 percent since 1924, while the salary for many of these executive officers has not been increased at all. Over the same period, the salaries of most Federal judges have also been doubled and the others have been increased by more than two-thirds. Substantial increases have been made recently in the compensation of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House. Since 1945 the compensation of Federal employees below the top executive level has been increased several times. The total increases range up to 96 percent in the lower grades. Salaries and wages in private industry have also been greatly increased in recent years, while no corresponding increase has been made in the salaries of Federal executives.

The legislation now pending in the Senate to correct this anomalous situation has had long and careful study. It has been considered at length and reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in both the Eightieth Congress and this Congress. It is in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. It has already passed the House of Representatives. The salary rates provided in the bill passed by the House and reported by the Senate committee are, for the most part, lower than those I recommended. Nevertheless, that bid does provide a reasonably adequate means for meeting this difficult problem. Together with the revisions of the Classification Act proposed in other legislation now pending, it will provide a pattern in which the salaries for different Federal positions have a much more reasonable relationship to the relative responsibilities of those positions than under present law.

In this letter concerning pending pay bills, I have spoken chiefly of the legislation concerning salaries for executive positions, because it is concerning those salaries that the most question appears to have been raised. I wish to point out, however, that all the pending bills are

related to one another and that substantial injustices are likely to be done unless the proper relationship between them is maintained.

I urge the Senate to act favorably upon this legislation, which will do so much to help me in properly discharging the duties of my office.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT AND AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

SPONSOR'S ASSURANCE IN FEDERAL AIRPORT GRANTS—RESOLUTION OF LEAGUE OF NORTH DAKOTA MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the 1949 convention of the League of North Dakota Municipalities, held at Minot, N. Dak., relating to the sponsor's assurance in connection with Federal airport grants.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION IN CONNECTION WITH SPONSOR'S ASSURANCE IN CONNECTION WITH FEDERAL AIRPORT GRANTS, ADOPTED BY THE 1949 LEAGUE OF NORTH DAKOTA MUNICIPALITIES CONVENTION AT MINOT, SEPTEMBER 13, 1949

Whereas section 9 of part III of the sponsor's assurance to be given by municipalities to the Civil Aeronautics Administration precedent to grants for construction and improvement of municipal airports requires that—

"Whenever so requested by the Administrator the sponsor will furnish to any civil agency of the United States, without charges (except for light, heat, and janitor services and similar facilities and services at a reasonable cost thereof) such space in airport

buildings as may be determined by the Administrator to be reasonably adequate for use in connection with any airport air-traffic-control activities, weather-reporting activities, and communication activities related to airport air-traffic control, which are necessary to the safe and efficient operation of the airport and which such agency may deem it necessary to establish and maintain at the airport for such purposes: *Provided, however*, That the amounts of space the sponsor may be required to furnish for such purposes and on such conditions, shall not be in excess of the maximum amounts prescribed in the grant agreement relating to the project. Such space or any portion thereof will be made available as provided herein within 6 months after receipt of written request from the Administrator. Additional building space for such purposes may be furnished to any civil agency of the United States upon such terms as may be agreed upon between such civil agency and the sponsor"; and

Whereas such sponsor's assurance agreement is an undue burden on municipalities developing municipal airports and is not definite as to the requirements thereof and does not give sufficient time to municipalities to provide space required: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the League of North Dakota Municipalities 1949 Annual Convention, That the Civil Aeronautics Administration be requested to amend said section 9 of part III of such sponsor's assurance agreement; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota, to the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, to the district airport engineer, Civil Aeronautics Administration for the State of North Dakota, and to the American Municipal Association.

FEDERAL AID FOR AIRPORTS—RESOLUTION OF LEAGUE OF NORTH DAKOTA MUNICIPALITIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the League of North Dakota Municipalities, at its 1949 convention at Minot, N. Dak., relating to Federal aid for airports.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION WITH RESPECT TO FEDERAL AID FOR AIRPORTS, ADOPTED BY THE LEAGUE OF NORTH DAKOTA MUNICIPALITIES CONVENTION AT MINOT, SEPTEMBER 13, 1949

Whereas the Federal Government has made available funds for the establishment and improvement of municipal airports in accordance with the Federal Airport Act of 1946; and

Whereas there are more than 40 communities of the 85 listed in the State of North Dakota in the 1949 National Airport Plan which do not have needed airport facilities to care for their aeronautical needs; and

Whereas the aeronautical activities of these communities are seriously handicapped and the safety of many is endangered through lack of proper airport facilities; and

Whereas a large part of the cost of constructing satisfactory airport facilities in the above-mentioned communities and particularly in the smaller communities in the State involves the purchase of land and under the provisions of the Federal Airport Act, 50 percent of the cost of constructing airports is provided but only 25 percent of the cost of purchasing land and developing the sites for the same is so provided: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the League of North Dakota Municipalities 1949 Convention, That Con-

gress be requested to amend the Federal Airport Act so as to provide for 50 percent grants to municipalities for land acquisition costs, the same as construction costs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives from North Dakota and to the American Municipal Association requesting their assistance in obtaining such amendment to the Federal Airport Act of 1946.

AMERICAN AID FOR EXPELLEES FROM CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter from Josef Totzauer, president, American Aid for Expellees From Czechoslovakia and Other European Countries, New York, N. Y., together with a resolution adopted by that organization on September 10, 1949, at New York City, relating to American aid for expellees from Czechoslovakia.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., September 10, 1949.
HON. SENATOR WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Five years have come to pass since the Yalta understanding initiated the greatest crime in history, the expelling of 15,000,000 people from their native homelands. With the signatures by the heads of Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and the United States, the Potsdam agreements became the shield by which revengeful governments could cover their inhuman actions against a helpless civilian population. The German race and German mother tongue of the victims was the only justification of their acts. Their object, as we know now, was loot and malice.

HISTORY'S GREATEST CRIME

Bishop Aloisius Muench, of Fargo, N. Dak., writes: "The forced migration of millions of people is the greatest crime of this age."

A distinguished journalist, Anne O'Hare McCormick, similarly stated on November 13, 1946, in the New York Times: "If allied statesmen had imagined how heavily this wandering mass of helpless people would beat upon themselves, they couldn't have assumed so casually the moral and historic responsibility for the most inhuman decision ever made by governments dedicated to the defense of human rights."

Senator WILLIAM LANGER in a speech in the Senate of the United States, April 5, 1949, made the following remarks on the inhuman mass deportations: "One of the greatest crimes against humanity in all of history, a crime to which we have directly been made a party."

As Senator LANGER said: "It is unbelievable that American representatives should have continued to be parties to these forced mass migrations which incriminate the whole American people as accomplices in mass crimes against humanity. Nowhere in recorded history has such a grim chapter of brutality been written than in the account of what has already taken place in eastern Europe. Already, from 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 have been uprooted bodily from their ancestral homes of a thousand years and thrown into the torment of a living hell, to perish, or to be driven like cattle across the wastes of eastern Europe. Women and children, the old and the helpless, the innocent and the guilty alike have been subjected to cruelties which have never been surpassed, even by the Nazis themselves. Yet, we are now committed to a continuation of these

same inhuman policies in the future, although the conscience of the American people cries out against such bestial practices."

DEPORTATIONS IN THE LIGHT OF THE NUREMBERG INDICTMENTS

At this point, it is well to remind ourselves of the charge against the Nazis, entered into the Nuremberg indictments. Count 3, section J, reads: "In certain occupied territories, purportedly annexed to Germany, the defendants methodically and pursuant to plan, endeavored to assimilate these territories, politically, culturally, socially, and economically, into the German Reich, and the defendants endeavored to obliterate the former national character of these territories. In pursuance of these plans and endeavors, the defendants forcibly deported inhabitants who were predominantly non-German and introduced thousands of German colonists."

"NO OBJECTION" TO EXPULSION (ROOSEVELT)

Again referring to war crimes, Mr. LANGER continues: "As far back as November 17, 1944, President Roosevelt agreed in principle to the very procedure which is now listed as a war crime by the Nuremberg tribunal, when, in a letter to Mr. Mikolajczyk, he stated, 'If the Polish Government and people desire in connection with the new frontier of the Polish state to bring about the transfer to and from territories of Poland of national minorities, the United States Government will raise no objection, and as far as practicable, will facilitate such transfer.'"

TOTAL EXPULSION PROPOSED BY CHURCHILL

Churchill, who now sees otherwise, asserted a few weeks later in the House of Commons, on December 15, 1944: "The transference of several millions of people would have to be effected from the east to the west or north, as well as the expulsion of the Germans from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and the south. For expulsion is the method which, so far as we can see, will be most satisfactory and lasting. I am not alarmed by the large transferences, which are more possible in modern conditions than ever before."

Thus, these once great statesmen played with the lives of innocent and helpless human beings. Not only Anne O'Hare McCormick, Senator Langer, and Bishop Muench were shocked by the cold-bloodedness of those who held the lives of millions in their hands. There were few Americans who did not, when informed, express deep resentment and concern. Mr. Bevin, who had at Potsdam witnessed the signing of the treaty and at Berlin seen with his own eyes the consequent arrival of the tortured, starved expellees from the east, exclaimed: "My God, it is the worst sight one possibly could see."

Accusingly adds Senator LANGER: "Mr. President, of those 15,000,000 persons 5,000,000 are dead." (It would not be exaggerated to add another million or two slave workers to the total.) "Yet, according to the directives of April 28, 1947, we formally agreed to underwrite more inhuman brutality, misery, and death. Mr. President, is it not time that this administration should give an accounting of its policies, and answer to this further charge of betraying American principles?"

ONLY CONGRESS CAN RIGHT THE WRONG

The American Aid for Expellees from Czechoslovakia speaking for many thousand Americans of Sudeten-German origin throughout our land, requests you to define your position on the unratified Potsdam and Yalta agreements by which the expulsions of 15,000,000 victims of hate have been effected. It is definitely against American tradition to participate in genocidal policies and at the same time pretend to be democratic by condemning others guilty of the same criminal action. As taxpayers we beg you to raise your voice in Congress against

further abandoning of these innocent victims to their fate. Let it be our duty as Americans to amend the wrong we have helped to inflict upon the guiltless either by opening our doors to them or making the return to their homeland a future possibility.

As righteous citizens of our democratic America we beg, hope, and believe that our representatives in Washington will make the fight to redress this crime against humanity an ever-present purpose not only in well-expressed phrases, but in effectual deeds.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEF TOTZAUER,
President, American Aid for Expellees From Czechoslovakia and Other European Countries.

RESOLUTION RE EXPELLEE LEGISLATION

Whereas 15,000,000 displaced persons of German ethnic origin were ruthlessly evicted from their homes and deprived of practically all their possessions in expulsions which were sanctioned by the United States, Great Britain, and Soviet Russia, without the consent of Congress; and

Whereas from ten to twelve surviving millions of these displaced persons called expellees are now in Germany and Austria, but are excluded from the care of the IRO (International Refugee Organization) because of their German ethnic origin; and

Whereas these people were for that reason excluded from consideration as displaced persons by the DP Act of 1948, although they have fled or were deported from their native homelands because of their religious beliefs, cultural traditions, or national origins; and

Whereas discrimination on account of race, creed, or nationality is inconsistent with the great and noble traditions of these United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Aid for Expellees From Czechoslovakia and Other European Countries requests our Congress to do whatever possible to right this wrong to our relatives and friends who were dispossessed and expelled from countries of their birth because of their religious beliefs, their race, or national origin; and be it further

Resolved, That we commend the steps already taken by the McCarran committee toward amendment of section 2 (b) of the DP Act of 1948 to the end that relief measures for displaced persons shall no longer be withheld from expellees because of their ethnic origin; and that expellees and expellee orphans shall hereafter be admitted in fair proportion and on the same terms as other displaced persons.

Unanimously adopted at New York City, September 10, 1949.

AMERICAN AID FOR EXPELLEES FROM
CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRIES,
JOSEF TOTZAUER, President,
ROLF TAUWINKEL, Secretary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5332. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones; with amendments (Rept. No. 1107).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 2597. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clyde Cecil Banks for certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2598. A bill to authorize reimbursement to the appropriations of the Bureau of Narcotics of moneys expended for the purchase of narcotics; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 2599. A bill for the relief of Arturo Benetti; and

S. 2600. A bill for the relief of Jan Karszo-Siedlewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2601. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Almee Hoyningen-Huene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2602. A bill for the relief of the General Rose Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2603. A bill for the relief of Olga Helen Simko and Ilse Steinhäuser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 2604. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government hospital for the insane, and for other purposes," approved April 27, 1904, as amended; and

S. 2605. A bill to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INVESTIGATION OF ACTIONS OF CERTAIN OFFICIALS OF THE PHILIPPINES RELATING TO AMERICAN BUSINESS INTERESTS

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 174), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the people of the United States have a total investment in the Republic of the Philippines estimated at \$840,000,000, of which \$45,000,000 is invested in Philippine Government bonds guaranteed by the United States Government and \$95,000,000 is invested in commercial ventures, and \$700,000,000 is invested by the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the United States Government has given to the Republic of the Philippines and its people in the form of aid, relief, and war-damage claims approximately \$1,000,000,000; and

Whereas the Export-Import Bank has lent to the Republic of the Philippines \$75,000,000 and recently made other direct loans to private enterprises in the Philippine Islands; and

Whereas the present Government of the Republic of the Philippines has continued in effect governmental war restrictions to the detriment of American businessmen and enterprises; and

Whereas officials of the Republic of the Philippines have sold United States war-surplus materials turned over to them under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in the black market and to foreign countries for personal profits: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That (a) there is hereby established a special committee to be composed of 12 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the

original appointment was made. The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a thorough and complete study and investigation of action of officials of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines which has been detrimental to American businessmen and enterprises and to ascertain the advisability of more definitely determining our present and future relations with the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 and the Philippine Trade Act of 1946.

(b) The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

(c) For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-first Congress; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed \$100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

STABILIZATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2522) to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us to the bill (S. 2522) to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities, and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. The amendment would provide mandatory 90-percent support for all basic farm commodities when they are either under acreage control or quotas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I submit amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2522) to stabilize prices of agricultural commodities, which are on page 4, line 7, to strike out the word "shorn", and on page 4, line 9, to strike out the word "shorn", and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the amendments by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD. The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BUTLER ON AMENDMENTS TO S. 2522 SO AS TO CONTINUE "PULLED" WOOL IN PRICE-SUPPORT OPERATIONS FOR WOOL

The proposed amendment merely strikes from page 4, lines 7 and 9, of S. 2522 the

word "shorn." The original wording of these provisions read "shorn wool", so that by striking the word "shorn" the provisions would read "wool" and would thereby include both "shorn" and "pulled" wool under the term "wool."

"Shorn" wool is wool removed from live sheep by a farmer by shearing.

"Pulled" wool is wool pulled from the pelts of the slaughtered animal consisting usually of slaughtered lambs and aged sheep.

The domestic production of shorn wool for 1948 clean basis was approximately 93,560,000 pounds, or about 230,000,000 grease basis. The domestic production of pulled wool clean basis was approximately 33,552,000 pounds, or about 50,000,000 grease basis.

The process of pulling the wool from the slaughtered pelts is done by wool pulleries. Most meat-packing firms have their own pulleries. There are some independently operated pulleries.

In all previous wool price-support operations pulled wool has been included together with shorn wool. Pulled wool represents approximately 26 percent of the annual domestic production of wool.

The reasons for including pulled wool in any price-support operation for wool are several.

1. All previous as well as the present wool-support program have included pulled wool.

2. "Pulled wool" is as much entitled to Government support as "shorn wool" as the combination of both make up the total domestic production of wool and together they determine the market price for wool which in turn is the basis for the determination of the parity price for wool.

3. Wool pulleries have always been regarded as producers of wool under all previous Government support operations.

4. All price-support benefits which are received by the pulleries on pulled wool are passed on to the wool grower and are reflected in the price the grower receives for his lambs and sheep.

5. It would be most impractical to have the Government price support apply to only 74 percent of the domestic production of wool (shorn) and leaving 26 percent (pulled) free to ruin the open market.

6. There is no question but that the wool grower who sells his lambs and sheep and does not receive any support on the pulled wool indirectly through the pulleries is being discriminated against.

7. The sheep grower places more importance on the price he receives for his lambs and sheep than he does on the price he receives for wool and if pulled wool is not supported like shorn wool the meat packers will be forced to lower their purchase prices of lambs and sheep and the grower would be penalized in the amount received for his lambs and sheep in the approximate amount of 50 to 75 cents per head.

8. If pulled wool were eliminated from the price-support operations it would permit 26 percent of the United States wool production to set the price for the entire wool market in the United States thereby throwing an increased burden on the Government in the nature of increased Government support payments for the 74 percent or the balance of the wool production which would be under the support program as shorn wool.

9. The wool growers of the United States speaking through their association, the National Wool Growers Association, favor and recommend that pulled wool be included in any price-support operation for wool (see testimony of J. M. Jones, secretary, National Wool Growers Association before Special Subcommittee of House Committee on Agriculture, June 7, 1949).

10. The meat packers would not benefit from including pulled wool in the wool support program. The price that the packers pay for the live animal is influenced by what they think they can get for all of the by-products which come from the animal; the

meat, the wool, and any other byproduct. If the price the packer receives for any of these products is guaranteed, it influences the price they pay for the animal and this in turn is reflected in a larger price being received by the sheep grower for his sheep.

11. If pulled wool is not included in the price-support program, it would very likely happen that unsupported pulled wool would force the shorn wool producer to sell at a much lower price than otherwise and would result in the Government being compelled to pay considerably larger support payments for shorn wool in order to bring the price of shorn wool up to the support level.

12. The House Agriculture Committee in its report on H. R. 5345 No. 993, page 25, expressed the feeling that production payments to persons other than the producers would be limited so far as is practicable. In the case of pulled wool, however, it is apparent that it would not be practicable to withhold support on pulled wool from the packers as pulled wool represents 26 percent of the total annual production of wool in the United States, therefore, it should be included as it has in the past in any price-support operation for wool for the many reasons stated above.

Attention is called to the fact that the attached amendment does not strike the word "shorn" from line 14 of S. 2522. Therefore this provision which reads "to encourage an annual production of approximately 360,000,000 pounds of shorn wool" (grease basis or about 144,000,000 clean basis) will not be affected by the amendment.

INCREASED COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. McMAHON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1689) to increase rates of compensation for the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1689, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CORDON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1689, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. WITHERS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HOEY, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. BYRD, Mr. TAFT, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. CAIN, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. JENNER, Mr. SCHOEPPPEL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KEM, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. TOBEY) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 1689) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CORDON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 498) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be

proposed by me to the bill (H. R. 1689) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies. This amendment is submitted with the approval of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. While several members of the committee, including myself, probably do not approve of the bill as it now stands, we do believe, in justice to the Federal Reserve Board and to the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, that this amendment should be unanimously submitted from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and ordered to lie on the table.

STATISM AND THE FARMER—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Statism and the Farmer, delivered by him at the National Republican Farm Conference, in Sioux City, Iowa, September 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEASURES BEFORE CONGRESS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary, prepared by him, of major measures pending before Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR LUCAS—ARTICLE BY ERNEST LINDLEY

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lucas' Stature Is Growing as Senate Majority Leader," written by Ernest Lindley and published in the Brooklyn Eagle for Tuesday, September 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GENERAL COAL STRIKE SITUATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH HEADLIGHT

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Isolated Field," relating to the coal strike situation; published in the Pittsburgh (Kans.) Headlight of September 23, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SETTLEMENT OF ALASKA BY VETERANS—EDITORIAL BY FRANK HUTCHINSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding a bill introduced by him providing for the settlement of Alaska by veterans written by Frank Hutchinson, editor of the Lufkin (Tex.) Democrat, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EXECUTIVES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the subject Executive Salaries, printed in the Washington Post of September 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POINT 4 IS A MUST—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Point 4 Is a Must," published in the New York Times for September 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THUNDER ON THE LEFT—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, at a time when our people could very well be

unreasonably alarmed, or possibly even unjustifiably complacent, by reason of recent disclosures indicating that Russia now possesses the atomic bomb, a dispassionate presentation of the situation is most desirable.

The editorial in the New York Times of this morning entitled "Thunder on the Left," reviews the present status of the cold war in atomic energy, so to speak, and points out the vital necessity for a well-reasoned course for the democracies from here on.

I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THUNDER ON THE LEFT

Some 300 years ago a gentleman named Eustace Peachtree wrote: "Among the notional dictes of antique Rome was the fancy that when men heard thunder on the left the gods had somewhat of special advertisement to import. Then did the prudent pause and lay down their affairs to study what omen Jove intended." Last Friday, in President Truman's announcement that an atomic explosion had taken place in Russia, we moderns heard this thunder. It was an expected thunder, the only doubt being as to how many years would have to pass after the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki before the echoes came back from another quarter. But while we were intellectually prepared, perhaps we were not for the most part emotionally prepared. Now we must gather ourselves together to decide whether in the light of this event we have been and are doing all that we ought to do, or whether there is something else that has not yet been undertaken.

A one-sided atomic war has seemed horrible enough. There are no words to express the horrors of a two-sided atomic war. What are we doing to prevent such a war? We made one effort when we offered to internationalize the atomic weapon. That effort has so far failed. We are making another effort in our concerted attempt, with our allies of the democratic nations, to strengthen ourselves against aggression. Part of this proposed new strength must be military. The North Atlantic Pact, already ratified by the Senate, and the military-aid program, last week accepted almost in full by the Senate, are essential to it. So is and has been our aid to Greece and Turkey. So might be some aid to the democratic forces of the Far East, not excluding the Nationalist remnant of China.

We and our friends are striving in various ways to restore the economic balance and productivity of the Western World. We are trying by such arrangements as the reciprocal trade agreements to set commerce free. Whatever else may be said of the devaluation of the British pound, this step was at least an attempt to prevent the world from being divided into three parts. President Truman's point four, looking toward an expansion of Government-guaranteed private investments abroad, has already had the unanimous approval of a Senate committee and its vast possibilities will be explored during the present session of the United Nations Assembly. Finally, the United Nations itself, still surviving after four nerve-racking years, must continue to be used as an instrument for peace. The very fact that Russia and her satellites, so deeply hostile to the democratic idea as we conceive it, send delegates to the Assembly and argue vehemently, as Mr. Vishinsky did on Friday, for the Soviet point of view, is itself a tribute, however unwilling, to world public opinion.

It is easy in the dark watches of the night to let our fears and our evil dreams outrun

our hopes. Even a successful atomic war would be a ghastly nightmare from which not much that we value would emerge unhurt. Yet who can doubt that the human mind, which has been able by the most intricate calculations and the most ingenious devices to unlock the forces of the atom, can also grapple with the forces of human relationships? These days call for genius in statesmanship as genius has been displayed in science. They demand of our leaders more than the very best they have so far given. They demand unflinching courage. They demand unconquerable loyalty to the ideals of human freedom and human dignity. They demand a patience that will not yield in essentials but will not be broken down in the dreary wastes of nonessentials. There is nothing new in what is now required of us. It has merely been written in letters of fire across the leftward sky.

What is true of democracy today was equally true 5 and 10 and 30 and 100 years ago. It may resort to weapons to defend itself. These weapons will grow even more terrible than any we can now conceive. But the democratic strength has never been in weapons. It has never been, and is not, in the atom bomb or in any other use of atomic power or in bacteriological warfare. It is in the hearts of men. Nothing that can happen in Russia can break that strength down. We have had to make it strong for a possible defensive war. But the final victory, the greatest victory of all human history, will be in making it prevail without war.

FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a few days ago I entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which H. R. 1746, a bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes, was passed. The papers have now been returned to the Senate from the House of Representatives, and I desire to have a correction made in the bill, in an amendment which was offered by the able junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON]. Through error his amendment was placed in the wrong part of the bill. The purpose of bringing the bill back is to have the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey inserted in the proper place in the bill. In order to take care of the matter, Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the following order:

On August 27, 1949, prior to the passage of H. R. 1746, a bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes, an amendment was adopted, on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], inserting on page 7, line 2, after the word "Service" at the end of section 5 the words "and shall be paid by the State as a part of its contribution to the total cost of such works."

This amendment, it appears, should have been inserted on page 7, line 21, after the word "works," so as to make the first sentence of the paragraph read as follows:

"Items included for engineering, inspection, and unforeseen contingencies in connection with any works to be constructed shall not exceed 10 percent of the cost of such works and shall be paid by the State as a part of its contribution to the total cost of such works."

In a further amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey, adopted as a substitute for the last sentence of section 4, the word "or" was incorrectly inserted in lieu of the word "for."

In order to correct the above errors, I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the following order:

"Ordered, That the vote on the passage of the said bill, the vote ordering the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill, and the votes agreeing to the two amendments be respectively reconsidered; that the amendment inserted on page 7, line 2, be transposed to page 7, line 21, following the word 'works,' and that it be agreed to; that in lieu of the word 'or' in the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] beginning on page 6, line 8, the word 'for' be substituted and that the amendment as amended be agreed to; and that the amendments be engrossed and the bill read a third time and passed."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

MILITARY PAY BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5007) to provide pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, certain amendments to the pending bill have been submitted. As Senators know, under the unanimous-consent agreement we are to vote at 5 o'clock this afternoon. I hope that any discussion upon amendments to the bill can take place at once.

It is possible that we may run out of discussion on the military pay bill. If we do, I intend to ask unanimous consent to take up the deficiency bill, which has been reported from the Appropriations Committee. I should like also to take up some other measure, perhaps one of the other pay bills. However, I dislike very much to take it up before we complete action on the pending bill, unless I can be assured that we can dispose of any other bill which we may take up this afternoon, which I doubt very much. I hope the debate will not run out, but it looks as though it may.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate on the pending bill is open until 3 o'clock, after which the time is divided.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator stated on Thursday of last week, I believe, that he would like to take up three or four pay bills. According to the list which I have, there are six pay bills. We are now considering the military pay bill. That leaves five others. With respect to one or two of them, members of the minority party wish to make speeches or offer amendments. I think it would be helpful if the Senator would indicate which of those bills he may wish to take up this afternoon, so that we may have notice.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot definitely determine until I know just how much discussion there is to be on the pending measure, or whether there are to be speeches upon extraneous matters. My hope was that we would take up what is known as the executive pay bill following disposition of the military pay bill. There is some opposition to the executive pay bill, and I thought perhaps it might be advisable to take up one of the others in advance of that and see if we cannot perhaps reach some compromise or agreement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe there is at least one Senator of the minority party who wishes to make a speech—I do not know how long the speech will be—in reference to the so-called post-office pay bill, which I believe is Calendar 850, Senate bill 2379.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana this question: In the event we find ourselves, between now and 5 o'clock, in a position where the debate lapses, would the Senator from Louisiana be in a position to have Senate bill 2379 considered?

Mr. LONG. I believe so.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the bill to establish a standard schedule of rates of basic compensation for certain employees of the Federal Government, and so forth.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not say we could reach a vote on it this afternoon, but at least we might be able to discuss it and make it the pending business momentarily, and then on tomorrow probably dispose of it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, is that the classification or the post-office bill?

Mr. LUCAS. It is the classified pay bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think I can safely say to the Senator that there is some objection to some of the features of that bill, which probably will take as long to dispose of as will the executive pay bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is the impression of the Senator from Louisiana that possibly the executive pay bill would be the best one to come up first, because both the executive pay bill and the classification pay bill proceed upon the assumption that the top officials of the Federal Government are being paid much too little, and that we need a higher standard of pay for them, because they are the ones who have not been included in the pay-increase bills from year to year, although Government employees in the lower pay brackets have been included.

So both bills proceed upon the assumption that the major raise is to come in the pay of the Federal officials in the upper pay brackets, although naturally the great bulk of the additional money to be spent as a result of the enactment of the bills will be in the lower brackets, because there are so many employees in those brackets.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I assume there will be controversy in regard to those pay bills, but probably little or no controversy in regard to the military pay

bill. As to the others, there seems to be some objection by various Senators. It really does not make much difference which pay bill we take up following the one now pending. The reason why I was rather anxious to wait in regard to the executive pay bill was because of the fact that we might be able to compromise, and thus reach some agreement which would not make the executive pay bill so objectionable.

Then, again, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is very much interested in that bill, requested that it go over, because he is unavoidably absent, and will be until tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. One of the difficulties with the classification bill, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Louisiana, is that already some of the classified personnel are receiving more pay than are many of the top officials of the executive departments. If the salaries of the lower-paid classified employees are to be increased again, without an increase in the pay of the top officials, there would be considerable objection.

Personally, I feel that the Senator from Louisiana is correct when he suggests that we should take them up more or less together, but that it would be well to take up the executive pay bill first.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, if the classification pay bill were to pass, and the executive pay bill were not to pass, many of the top officials of the Federal Government would then receive considerably less pay than certain of the personnel working under them.

So it seems to me that the executive pay bill should be passed first.

Mr. TOBEY. Let me suggest that if the classification pay bill were passed and the executive pay bill were not passed, the result would be weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have another suggestion; I do not know whether it will meet with the approval of the minority, because no notice of this matter has been given; but I suggest that in the event we find ourselves with nothing to consider, we might take up the calendar for several hours. We could have a quorum call and then consider the calendar for several hours.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. After having discussed the matter with two Members of the minority party who are responsible for inquiring into the bills on the calendar, I understand that they are not ready to have the calendar taken up, and hope they will have until the end of the week.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I suggest that we take up House bill 6008, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1950. That bill is on the calendar, and I think it can be disposed of very readily. So I hope that

appropriation bill may be considered at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6008, the supplemental deficiency bill to which the Senator from Tennessee has just referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether the Senator from Tennessee knows of any Members of the Senate on either side of the aisle who wish to offer any amendments to that bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; there are several amendments. After the committee amendments are read by the clerk, it will take only a few moments to dispose of them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I ask the majority leader whether he believes we should have a quorum call in order that all Senators may be advised that we are taking up the appropriation bill. I would suggest the absence of a quorum; and if a quorum call is had, I know of no objection from Senators on this side of the aisle in respect to considering that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Massachusetts withhold his objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I withhold the objection until after the quorum call is had.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts wishes to be in a position either to object or not object after the quorum call is had. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes; with the Vice President's help.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Of course, the Vice President cannot be in a position to help either in one way or another in regard to such a matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Myers
Bridges	Jenner	Neely
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Chapman	Kem	Robertson
Chavez	Kerr	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cordon	Knowland	Schoeppel
Donnell	Langer	Smith, Maine
Downey	Leahy	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Fulbright	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
George	McFarland	Tobey
Gillette	McKellar	Vandenberg
Green	Magnuson	Watkins
Gurney	Malone	Wherry
Hayden	Martin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Maybank	Williams
Hickenlooper	Miller	Withers
Hoey	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that the unfinished business be laid aside and that

the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6008, the supplemental appropriation bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may say I know of no one on the minority side who wishes to object to taking up the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6008) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Legislative branch," on page 2, after line 1, to insert:

SENATE

Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: Effective on the first day of the first month following enactment of this act, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1950 is made available for the compensation of one additional special employee at the basic rate of \$1,000 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

For payment to Adelaide R. Hasse for compensation for the compilation of the index digest of the Temporary National Economic Committee, \$3,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 5, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Senate restaurants: For repairs, improvements, furnishings, and equipment for the Senate Restaurant, Senate Office Building, including personal and other services, \$13,500, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol under the supervision of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

Capitol buildings: For an additional amount for "Capitol buildings," \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Housing and Home Finance Agency—Office of the Administrator—Salaries and expenses," on page 6, line 5, before the word "and," to strike out "\$2,500,000" and insert "\$2,900,000"; in line 7, after the word "exceed," to strike out "two" and insert "three"; in the same line, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "(including the one provided for in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950)", and in line 9, after

the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That the Administrator may, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transfer to this account from funds of the constituent agencies such sums as relate primarily to functions which are consolidated in the Office of the Administrator as authorized by said title.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Housing Administration," on page 7, line 5, after the word "Administration", to strike out "\$4,125,000" and insert "\$4,375,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 12, to insert:

NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary for the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to prepare and carry out a program for the commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, as authorized by the acts of July 18, 1947 (Public Law 203), and May 31, 1949 (Public Law 78), including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia; travel expenses of employees; travel, hotel, and other necessary expenses of the Commissioners; printing, binding, and other related work to be done by contract or otherwise at establishments other than the Government Printing Office; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and such construction or other expenses as may now be authorized by law; \$3,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 3, to insert:

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION REPAIR OF VESSELS IN NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE

For repair of 134 vessels in the national defense reserve pursuant to section 11 (a) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 41), \$25,000,000; of which not more than \$804,630 shall be available for administrative expenses and not more than \$75,370 shall be available for operation of warehouses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia," on page 8, after line 12, to insert:

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL

For an additional amount for "Office of the corporation counsel," \$11,660.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 16, to insert:

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

MEDICAL CHARITIES

For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for "Medical charities" for care and treatment of indigent patients under contracts made by the Health Officer of the District of Columbia and approved by the Commissioners with institutions as follows: Children's Hospital, \$1,227; Eastern Dispensary and Casualty Hospital, \$50,582.35; Central Dispensary and Emergency Hospital, \$51,256.60; in all, \$103,065.95.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Settlement of claims and suits," on page 11, line 24, after "(46 Stat. 500)",

to strike out "\$6,950" and insert "\$8,198.03."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture," on page 12, after line 16, to strike out the subhead "Farmers Home Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Farm housing," on page 13, line 8, after "(5 U. S. C. 150)", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "\$3,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Forest Service—Emergency reconstruction and repair," on page 13, line 15, after the word "repair", to strike out "\$325,000" and insert "\$450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Commerce—Bureau of the Census—Seventeenth decennial census," on page 13, line 23, before the word "and", to strike out "\$7,500,000" and insert "\$8,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 14, after line 17, to insert:

CONSTRUCTION, BUILDINGS AND UTILITIES

For an additional amount for "Construction, and so forth, buildings and utilities," as follows:

Klamath, Ore.: \$150,000, in accordance with the act of August 19, 1949, Public Law 256.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State," on page 19, after line 10, to insert:

PORT-AU-PRINCE BICENTENNIAL EXPOSITION

For carrying out the provisions of the joint resolution of August 19, 1949 (Public Law 251, 81st Cong.), authorizing Federal participation in the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, \$170,000, to remain available through June 30, 1951.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department," on page 22, after line 5, to insert:

BUREAU OF THE MINT

MEDAL FOR ALLEN W. BARKLEY, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

For carrying out the provisions of Public Law 221, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 12, 1949, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Claims for damages and judgments," on page 22, line 17, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 111, and"; and in line 18, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$568,054.44" and insert "\$1,033,748.54."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and myself, and by request of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the amendment which the committee agreed the Senator from Oklahoma should offer from the floor, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, after line 17, it is proposed to insert the following:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act, as amended, and to provide for rural telephones and other purposes: *Provided*, That the following two paragraphs shall be effective only upon the enactment into law during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress of H. R. 2960, as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, \$250,000, of which amount \$35,000 may be transferred to and made a part of the appropriation for the Office of the Solicitor.

Loans: For loans in accordance with title II and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 of title I, \$25,000,000, to be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the applicable provisions of section 8 of title I.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma explain his amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the House recently passed what is known as the rural telephone bill. That bill when it reached the Senate was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which reported it favorably, and it is now on the calendar. Unless it passes the Senate before we adjourn this item would not be in order; but I take it for granted that the bill will be considered and passed before we adjourn. Anticipating that situation, I think the money should be appropriated and be available so that the Administration can prepare the forms and be ready to consider applications as soon as possible after the bill becomes law. For that reason, anticipating favorable final action, I have offered this amendment.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma for his foresight in offering this amendment to the bill. He has done a very fine job in getting the rural telephone bill reported by his committee, and I am certainly delighted that we shall have a chance to vote on this matter today.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was authorized by the Appropriations Committee to submit an amendment, which I will ask the clerk to read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, a little while ago the Senate adopted to the bill an amendment which was proposed by my colleague, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I wish to have the RECORD show at this point that my colleague is absent from the Senate today by leave of the Senate. I know that if he had been present he would have expressed his gratifi-

cation at the action of the Senate in agreeing to the amendment to make provision for carrying into effect the Rural Telephone Act, in the event that act receives final approval by the Senate and the House of Representatives at this session of Congress. He has worked very hard on that particular legislation. I merely wanted, in his behalf, to express appreciation for the action of the Senate in agreeing to the amendment which he has proposed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to join in what the Senator from Alabama has stated. Year after year after year his colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has introduced legislation along this line. He perhaps has worked harder for it than any other Member of the Senate. I am sorry he is not here today to see the amendment agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have another amendment, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina and offer my second amendment later.

Mr. MAYBANK. It will take only a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, after line 4, it is proposed to insert the following:

The second proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Public Housing Administration" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, is hereby repealed as of August 24, 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, for the sake of the RECORD, will the Senator explain the purpose of his amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, my amendment would repeal the rider in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1950 which prevents local housing agencies from making any payments in lieu of taxes in excess of those provided for in the original contract between the local housing agency and the Public Housing Administration.

The Senate Appropriations Committee two times this session, in the first deficiency appropriation and in the independent offices appropriation repealed this limitation on payments in lieu of taxes and two times this honorable body concurred. The Housing Act of 1949, Public Law 171, likewise provided for the repeal of this limitation and set forth in full the policy and requirements with respect to payments in lieu of taxes. Both Houses of Congress accepted these provisions and on July 15 it became part of the law of the land.

In spite of this, the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill recommended the restrictive proviso be included and it was so enacted. While the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] protested vigorously against this action, he did not move to reconsider its adoption because he did

not want to delay the urgently needed appropriations in the bill.

In offering this amendment I am trying to undo in this appropriation bill what the Independent Offices Appropriation Act did to undo legislation which this same Congress passed. I am merely attempting, Mr. President, to make the language of this appropriation for the housing agency consistent with the statutory language of the housing act. My amendment if enacted into law, as I hope it will be, will repeal the rider in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1950 as if it were never in effect.

My amendment will end the discrimination in the payments in lieu of taxes as between cities throughout the Nation. All cities will be treated alike, and whether a city receives a fair payment in lieu of taxes will no longer depend on whether some contract was equitably worked out or drawn up at all by someone here in Washington. No longer will cities who are having difficulty meeting the high cost of providing their citizens with the services they require be deprived of a fair and equitable payment because a contract was drawn up 10 or 12 years ago, or that the contract was drawn up when Government costs were low.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a list of projects on which the cooperation agreement and the assistance contract provide for no payments in lieu of taxes.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROJECTS ON WHICH THE COOPERATION AGREEMENT AND THE ASSISTANCE CONTRACT PROVIDE FOR NO PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

1. These projects will be unable to make any payments in lieu of taxes to the municipalities for the project fiscal year in respect to which annual contribution dates occur during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, unless the second proviso in the paragraph under the heading, "Public Housing Administration" in title I of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, is repealed.

PUBLIC LAW 412 PROJECTS

Alexandria, Va-4-1, 2.
Ft. Lauderdale, Fla-10-1, 2.
High Point, NC-6-1, 2.
Kinston, NC-4-1, 2.
Lakeland, Fla-11-1.
Macon, Ga-7-1, 2, 2A, 3.
Madisonville, Ky-7-1, 2.
New Bedford, Mass-7-1, 2.
New Bern, NC-5-1, 2.
North Little Rock, Ark-2-1.
San Antonio, Tex-6-1, 1A, 3, 4, 5.
Sarasota, Fla-8-1.
Texarkana, Tex-14-1, 2.
Dallas, Tex-9-1, 2, 5.
Fresno, Calif-6-1, 2, 3.
Hartford, Conn-3-1, 2, 3, 3A.
Holyoke, Mass-5-1.
Houston, Tex-5-1, 2, 4, 5.
Pittsburgh, Pa-1-1, 2, 3.
Twin Falls, Idaho-1-1, 2.
Brownsville, Tex-7-1.
Delaware County, Ind-4-1.
Frankfort, Ky-3-1.
Harrisburg, Pa-8-1, 2.
Kokomo, Ind-7-1.
Louisville, Ky-1-1.
Louisville, Ky-1, 2.
Louisville, Ky-1-3, 4.
Rome, Ga-5-1, 2.
Orlando, Fla-4-1.
Corpus Christi, Tex-9-1, 2, 3.
Great Falls, Mont-2-1.

Helena, Mont-4-1.
 Laredo, Tex-11-1.
 Muncie, Ind-5-1.
 Pensacola, Fla-6-1, 2.
 Tampa, Fla-3-1R, 2, 3.
 West Palm Beach, Fla-9-1, 2.
 St. Petersburg, Fla-2-1.
 Allentown, Pa-4-1.
 Syracuse, NY-1-1.
 Utica, NY-6-1.
 Washington, DC-1-1, 2, 4, 7.
 Anniston, Ala-4-1.
 Charleston, WVa-1-1, 2.
 Kingsport, Tenn-6-1, 2.
 Raleigh, NC-2-1, 2.
 Reading, Pa-9-1.
 Wilmington, NC-1-1, 2.
 St. Petersburg, Fla-2-1A.
 Bristol, Va-2-1, 2.
 Paducah, Ky-6-1, 2.
 Jacksonville, Fla-1-1, 1A, 2.
 Pawtucket, RI-2-1R.
 Bridgeport, Conn-1-2.
 Biloxi, Miss-5-1, 2, 3.
 Brownsville, Tex-7-2.
 Daytona Beach, Fla-7-1A.
 Daytona Beach, Fla-7-2.
 Hattiesburg, Miss-1-1, 2.
 Hopewell, Va-5-1.
 Honolulu, TH-1-1.
 Marietta, Ga-10-1R, 2.
 New Britain, Conn-5-1.
 Phenix City, Ala-5-1R, 2.
 Phoenix, Ariz-1-1, 2, 3.
 Spartanburg, SC-3-1, 2.
 Waco, Tex-10-1, 2.
 Wheeling, WVa-3-2.
 Williamson, WVa-8-1, 2.
 Athens, Ga-3-1, 1A, 2.
 Brunswick, Ga-9-1, 2.
 Butte, Mont-3-1.
 Columbus, Ga-4-1R, 1RA, 2, 2A.
 Fort Wayne, Ind-3-1.
 Lexington, Ky-4-1, 2.
 Martinsburg, WVa-6-1, 2.
 Newport News, Va-3-1.
 Baytown (formerly Pelly) Tex-12-1, 2.
 Stamford, Conn-7-1.
 Mayaguez, PR-4-1, 2.
 Ponce, PR-1-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7.
 Puerto Rico, PR-3-1 to 3-12.
 San Juan, PR-2-1, 2, 3, 4.
 Daytona Beach, Fla-7-1.
 Huntington, WVa-4-1, 2, 3.
 Mount Hope, WVa-7-1.
 Vincennes, Ind-2-1.
 Clarksdale, Miss-7-1.
 East Baton Rouge, La-3-1, 2.
 Lake Charles, La-4-1, 2.
 New Haven, Conn-4-1, 3, 4.
 Seattle, Wash-1-1.
 Miami, Fla-5-1, 2, 3.
 Charlotte, NC-3-1, 1A, 2.
 Holyoke, Mass-5-2.
 Woonsocket, RI-3-1.
 Pittsburgh, Pa-1-4, 5.
 Superior, Wis-1-1.
 Greenville, SC-4-1.
 Lakeland, Fla-11-2.
 Dothan, Ala-7-1.
 Brownwood, Tex-21-1.
 Dallas, Tex-9-3, 4.
 Dallas, Tex-9-44.
 Houston, Tex-5-7.
 Los Angeles County, Calif-2-1, 5, 4.
 Mesa, Ariz-5-1.
 Sacramento City, Calif-5-1.
 Sacramento County, Calif-7-1.
 Upland, Calif-9-2.
 Providence, RI-1-1, 2.
 Fort Wayne, Ind-3-2.
 Alexandria, La-23-1, 2.
 Galveston, Tex-17-1.
 Galveston, Tex-17-2.
 Kern County, Calif-8-1, 2.
 Oakland, Calif-3-1, 2, 3.
 Anaconda, Mont-5-1.
 Clallam County, Wash-4-2.
 Fayetteville, NC-9-1, 2.
 Norfolk, Va-6-3.
 Richmond, Va-7-1.
 Brownsville, Tex-7-3.

Conway, Ark-6-1, 2.
 Fort Smith, Ark-3-1.
 Little Rock, Ark-4-1, 2, 3.
 Glendale, Ariz-3-1.
 Hawaii, TH-1-2.
 Richmond, Calif-10-1, 2.
 San Bernardino, Calif-19-1, 2.
 Santa Barbara County, Calif-21-1.
 Tucson, Ariz-4-1.
 King County, Wash-2-1.
 Seattle, Wash-1-4.
 Seattle, Wash-1-5.
 Middletown, Conn-9-1.
 Bethlehem, Pa-11-1.
 New Albany, Ind-12-1, 2.
 Albany, Ga-23-1, 2.
 Orlando, Fla-4-2.
 Pensacola, Fla-6-3.
 Lubbock, Tex-16-1.
 South San Francisco, Calif-15-1.
 Bremerton, Wash-3-1.
 Washington, DC-1-3, 6, 9, 11, 12.
 Newport, RI-5-1.
 Allentown, Pa-4-2.
 Hartford, Conn-3-4.

2. In addition to the above, there are a large number of other projects, both Public Law 412 and Public Law 671, in which cooperation agreements and assistance contracts do require some payments in lieu of taxes, but these amounts are less than the amounts authorized by section 305 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949 (Public Law 171, 81st Cong.). The payments authorized in these cases are in various amounts and percentages, such as 2 percent of shelter rent, 2½ percent, 3 percent, etc.; therefore, if the proviso in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, is not repealed, the allowable payments in lieu of taxes in these cases would be limited to such smaller amounts or percentages.

3. There is still a third category of cases in which the outstanding assistance contract between the Public Housing Administration and the local authority authorizes payments in lieu of taxes equal to 5 percent, but such outstanding contracts are revisions of earlier contracts which authorized smaller amount or none at all. Under the proviso contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, which limits the allowable payments in lieu of taxes to amounts contained in the original contract between the Public Housing Administration and the local authority, the payments in lieu of taxes would have to be limited to the lesser amount and the Public Housing Administration would then be in default under the terms of the outstanding revised contracts. The projects falling in this category are the following: Baltimore, Md.; Detroit, Mich.; Norwalk, Conn.; Atlanta, Ga.; Annapolis, Md.; Beverly, N. J.; Jackson, Tenn.; Nashville, Tenn.; Denver, Colo.; Key West, Fla.; Los Angeles, Calif.; New York, N. Y.; Omaha, Nebr.; Springfield, Ill.; Trenton, N. J.; Frederick, Md., and McKeesport, Pa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move to amend the bill, on page 10, line 12, by striking out "\$50,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$100,000."

I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] if he will make a brief statement of the facts concerning this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my suggestion would be that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee accept this amendment and take it to confer-

ence. It has to do with day-care centers, which have been operating from year to year in the District of Columbia. An act of Congress was passed which came out of the District Committee of the House and the District Committee of the Senate, extending it for one more year. The act itself provided that the amount allotted to this work should be \$100,000. It was shown in the testimony that the contribution by the parents or guardians of the children would be approximately \$50,000. Actually it was approximately \$48,000. The House Committee on Appropriations took the view that the amount of money to be appropriated would be equal only to the sum which the parents provided, but inasmuch as the authorizing act contemplated \$100,000, perhaps we can persuade the House if we take the matter to conference to adjust it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, necessity commands us and humanity entreats us to adopt the pending amendment. Its defeat would cause irreparable injury and distress to a vast army which is composed of highly praiseworthy working women from the District of Columbia and from practically every State in the Union. Failure to increase the appropriation, as proposed by the amendment which I have proposed would necessitate the closing of a number of service centers which, by caring for the children of these working women, make it possible for their mothers, many of whom are widows, to earn a livelihood both for themselves and their little ones who are wholly dependent upon them. As a result of my conversations with various Senators concerning this important matter, I am convinced that further debate is unnecessary and that the vote in favor of the amendment will be indicative of appropriate senatorial reverence for the Master's admonition "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God."

Please let me urge that the amendment be approved without dissenting voice or vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to call up an amendment which was authorized by the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, after line 4, it is proposed to insert:

INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN, NORTH DAKOTA

For the construction of roads, trails, buildings, utilities, and other improvements, including expenses incidental thereto, necessary for completion of the International Peace Garden, North Dakota, \$25,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress of H. R. 2369.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the International Peace Garden referred to is sponsored by the State of North Dakota and the Canadian Government. It started previous to World War II. Authorizing legislation for this appropriation passed the House and is now pending in the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I understand it has the approval of that committee. This appropriation cannot be effective until the legislation has been passed by Congress and signed by the President.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a further explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL, H. R. 2369, TO AUTHORIZE AN APPROPRIATION TO COMPLETE THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN, NORTH DAKOTA

The North Dakota State Legislature in 1935 authorized and directed the Governor to accept title to certain lands on the Canadian border to be known as the International Peace Garden, for the purpose of furthering international peace among the nations of the world.

An 888-acre park was established as the result of this legislation and the Canadian Government, urged by the Royal Horticultural Society of London, established a park of approximately 1,300 acres on the Canadian side of the border. The National Park Service, between 1934 and 1941, during the Civilian Conservation Corps program, assisted in development of the park on the American side of the border. The abrupt entry of the United States into World War II, however, and the resulting discontinuance of the Civilian Conservation Corps program, left the International Peace Garden unfinished.

The Dominion of Canada is developing the park on its side of the border and the \$100,000 authorized is for the purpose of aiding the State of North Dakota to develop that part of the park in the United States.

The Federal project was on a somewhat larger scale than would have been undertaken by the State without assistance from the National Park Service and the Civilian Conservation Corps, and, therefore, it may be regarded that there is a moral obligation on the part of the Federal Government to assist in the completion of this project.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that this is the same type of amendment as that which was passed in connection with the rural telephone provision?

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the bill covering it on the calendar yet?

Mr. YOUNG. No; it is not. The appropriation would not be effective until authorizing legislation is passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I offer a second amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 22, after line 1, it is proposed to insert the following:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Refund of taxes illegally assessed and paid by Indian wards: For the payment by the Treasury Department of the principal amount of any claim or claims for refund of income taxes filed within the 2-year period permitted by and pursuant to the declared policy of Congress as contained in section 2 of the act of Congress of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21), by or on behalf of any Indian allottee of the class mentioned therein as having been required or permitted to pay any Federal income tax on the rents, royalties, or other gains arising from such allotment during the minority of the allottee, \$200,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief explanation of the amendment. A bill embodying the substance of the amendment passed the House at this session and is pending in the appropriate committee of this body, but for fear we will not get action on it at this session, I have offered the amendment just read. The House bill provides not only for the payment of claims when approved but for the payment of interest on such claims. This amendment eliminates the interest and provides for the payment of claims only in the event the Treasury Department finds the claims are just. In the early days in my State of Oklahoma all Indian property was taxed by the Federal Government and by the State government. The Indians, of course, complained, because, being wards of the Government, they did not think they should pay taxes. But, in any event, they were forced to pay taxes, and claims for refunds have been presented to the Government many of which have been paid.

There are claims of Indians who were minors at the time the tax was paid, and such Indian minors did not know of their rights, and from time to time the provision for refunds has been extended, but now we ask for a sufficient extension to permit those former minors—now, of course, adults—to have a chance to go into court or before the Treasury Department and present their claims, and if just to secure refunds. If the Treasury determines that the claims are just, they will pay them; if they determine they are not, they will not pay them. That is the whole question involved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment provides for paying the principal of the claims, without the interest, which would amount really to very much more than the principal, because of the time the claims have run. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator is correct. The claims having run some 40 years, the interest alone on them would amount to more than the principal. The committee did not see fit to authorize the payment of the interest. We hope to get the matter settled, as it has been pending already for too long—for the 27 years I have been a Member of the Congress to my certain knowledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The proviso in the paragraph under the heading "National Labor Relations Board" contained in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, shall not be interpreted to include fruit and vegetable packing house workers.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the proviso to which the amendment refers, which was included in the third deficiency bill, reads as follows under the heading "National Labor Relations Board":

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (Public Law 101, approved June 23, 1947), and as defined in section 3 (f) of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060).

That proviso has been carried in the appropriation bills, in the National Labor Relations Board item, for the past 4 years, and has caused no difficulty of any kind until the present year, when the Board by a ruling decided that agricultural laborers as defined by the act including packing shed workers. Up to last January I believe it was, they had not been included, and whenever there was a dispute in any packing shed in the United States where vegetables or fruits were being loaded the National Labor Relations Board participated and settled the dispute. Where there was a question of an election, to decide what labor organization should represent the laborers, there was no difficulty. But the recent ruling makes it so that if a pear crop, for instance, which must be marketed within a few weeks, is to be gathered, and there should be a quick strike, the Board could not follow the usual methods of arbitration and conciliation which the Board employs in settling controversies of that kind.

My suggestion in offering the amendment is that the Senate adopt the proviso and that it be taken to conference. I do not know that it is entirely perfect, but I am sure that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], with whom I talked about it in the committee, will agree with me that a very difficult situation would be presented if the new ruling by the Board made it impossible in any way to conciliate or arbitrate or handle a strike in a packing shed which is not a farm operation, and had not been so considered until last January.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I hope the Senator will correct me if I am wrong, but as the situation now stands, the prohibition to which the Senator refers would act to prevent any conciliation attempt on the part of the conciliation officials in the case of a strike or a threatened strike. It would leave the parties at arm's length at the one time above all others when any intervention which would succeed in getting the packing sheds working would be most invaluable, and might be the means of saving a whole crop of perishables.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly my understanding of the situation.

Mr. CORDON. As I said to the Senator, I am not certain that the amendment will do exactly what the Senator feels should be done and what the Senator from Oregon feels is advisable, and I think perhaps attention should be given in the conference if the amendment shall be adopted, to a careful checking of the term "packing-house workers," so as to be certain that it does not include operations on the farm which are purely incidental to the agricultural operation itself. I believe the amendment of sufficient importance to go to conference, and I shall support the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. I expect to be one of the conferees, and I assure the Senator I shall take the matter up and endeavor to have drafted exactly the right language, so that nothing will be done that has not been done freely heretofore in the past, during all the years this proviso has been upon the statute books, until the recent change in the attitude of the Board.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Board is prohibited from using any money in relation to this particular kind of work under the prior provision, how did the case get before it, if it was not allowed to have jurisdiction?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not the entire history of matters pertaining to this proviso. I tried to confer with a former member of this body, Mr. Murdock, who is a member of the Board, who promised to give me some information about it. It is perfectly clear that this language has not been construed, until recently, to include packing-house workers. It is designed and intended to prevent the organization of agricultural labor, and that is all it is intended for. That means somebody working on a farm, or where a packing shed is alongside a railroad track and men and women are employed putting fruit in boxes or putting lettuce and other vegetables in crates. They are not working on a farm, and never until this recent change of mind on the part of the Board have they been considered agricultural laborers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Up to the present time, have not activities on farms where there were packing houses been considered agricultural?

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. The products moved directly from the field to so-called warehouses, where the workers sorted them, and all the workers were treated as farm laborers, were they not?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, not until January of this year. Prior to that time they were not considered to be agricultural workers because they were not employed on the land. They were employed in a building putting fruit in boxes or lettuce or other vegetables in crates.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator understand, as does the Senator from Oregon, that the testimony before the subcommittee was to the effect that the National Labor Relations Board had deemed that so-called packing-house workers were not included within the prohibition, but had never formally decided the question, and had operated under the assumption that that was the law, until the matter came up to them in two cases, I believe, when they reversed their former position to the extent that they made a decision which in itself, by virtue of its character, prohibited them from hereafter doing what before that they had done on the assumption that they were permitted to do it under the proviso?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a correct statement. For that reason, if the amendment is adopted, we can take it up with the Board and secure a clear definition so there will be no difficulty about the matter.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I may say that that is the view of the Senator from Oregon, and that is the reason he has taken the position he has taken with reference to this provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if the adoption of the amendment would mean that jurisdiction would be given to the NLRB over labor in packing sheds and the like handling agricultural products in their original or natural state? If it would so do, in my judgment, it would make a very great departure from the law as it has always been announced and always been interpreted, and I would certainly want to know from the distinguished Senator that the amendment would not have any such result.

Mr. HAYDEN. All I can state to the Senator from Florida is I know that in California, in the Salinas area, and in Arizona, in the Salt River Valley area, where there have been disputes between the packers, those who operate the packing sheds along the railroad track and their workers, the NLRB has adjusted those disputes. The Board has also arranged for elections where there was a doubt as to whether one union or another should represent the workers. They have always considered them not to be agricultural laborers. I am sure

that is the situation in California and in Arizona. I cannot say anything about what the situation is in Florida or elsewhere, but I know the statement I have made applies to California and Arizona. After a crop is grown and ready to be shipped, lettuce already picked, or carrots taken out of the ground, ready to be shipped, or if a crop of pears, which are highly perishable, has been picked, if a dispute arose and nothing could be done by way of mediation or conciliation, I know it would be disastrous. In such event, there might arise innumerable difficulties which ought to be straightened out, and such difficulties have been straightened out until recently.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator if the proposal does not represent a change in the substantive law rather than legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; there never has been any substantive law on the subject. But for 4 years we have carried these identical words as a limitation upon the appropriations for the National Labor Relations Board. There is no statute on the subject. The only difficulty that exists now grows out of the recent interpretation of the words to mean more than they were considered to mean by the Board for more than 3 years up until this last year. I can say to the Senator from Florida that certainly I have no desire in the world to confer any additional jurisdiction upon the National Labor Relations Board above and beyond what they exercised prior to last January, and which was customary up to last January. If this amendment goes to conference, if any doubt exists about it, we can straighten it out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. While I fully appreciate the objectives of the distinguished Senator from Arizona, and I have no doubt that he does not want to disturb the prevailing law, in my view the adoption of this amendment would very probably do so. The provision in the third deficiency bill which has been referred to, reads as follows, and I quote from page 14 of the bill, lines 11 to 20 inclusive, as follows:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the act of July 5, 1935, and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the act of June 25, 1938.

Mr. President, my understanding of this problem is that a long dispute has existed behind the insertion of this provision which I have just read, into the various appropriation acts in which it has been placed. It has been placed in such acts by the insistence of Congress, as I understand, to make it clear that Congress has no intention ever to allow

the National Labor Relations Board to use the appropriation, or to exercise jurisdiction in connection with the organization or the assistance in organizing agricultural laborers, or for investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers.

My understanding is based on considerable dealing with this particular situation in the State of Florida, where there has been distinction made between the work in the handling of fruits and vegetables in their native state, or in their natural condition, in which case the workers have been held, as I understand it, to be agricultural laborers, whereas in the case of those who are in the canneries or in the processing plants which change the form of the natural product, the contrary has been held, and the NLRB has been allowed to maintain jurisdiction and to expend Federal funds in assisting in the organization of the latter class of agricultural laborers, as I have mentioned, whereas they have not been permitted to do so at all—either to claim jurisdiction or to expend Federal funds—in connection with the organization or the investigation or arbitration of disputes in the case of the workers in the packing sheds, or packing houses, which handle the fruit and the vegetables in their native state.

What I sincerely fear is that the wording of this amendment as now proposed would operate to defeat the insistence of the Congress throughout the years that the definitions it had insisted upon be interpreted in accordance with the interpretation which I have already suggested, which has distinguished between operations in the packing sheds, where the fruit or vegetables are handled in their natural state, and the operations in the processing plants, where the fruits or vegetables are placed in cans or where they are concentrated or dehydrated or handled in some manufacturing process.

I am very fearful that the adoption of the amendment would completely undo the long stand of Congress, the insistent stand, which it has been attempted, by a nibbling process of interpretations or regulations, to evade. It would, in my judgment, rather dangerously operate against the long stand of Congress along the lines which I have just mentioned.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not that exactly what the amendment proposes to do—to make such a change?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; not at all. All the amendment proposes to do—I am sorry it had to be prepared hurriedly—is to restore the previous definition of what is an agricultural laborer and to follow procedures which were followed by the NLRB until last January. Up to that time, to my personal knowledge, in Arizona and in California, and I think the Senator from Florida will find it to be true in Florida, where a packing shed is located alongside a railroad track and the fruit or the vegetables are brought to the track, and there are put in the boxes and placed on the train, the workers have not been considered to be agricultural laborers. If the work were done

on a farm, however, that would be a very different matter. If I had a packing shed on my farm and I used the same labor I employed to grow the crop to pack it, that would clearly be agricultural labor. The fact is that they are migratory workers. They begin with cantaloups, for example, in the Imperial Valley. They go into the packing sheds, pack the cantaloups in crates, and put them in cars. Then they go to Yuma, then to the Salt River Valley, and then up into Colorado. They follow the crop, and work along the railroad tracks. There have been innumerable disputes, which have been mediated and conciliated, elections have been held, and all that. So I am sure that the Senator from Florida is in error.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator from Florida has that very thing in mind. These workers pack in boxes the grapefruit, oranges, or other fruit brought in from the farms, along the railroad track or along the highway.

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator from Florida say that the persons he knows about in Florida who do that kind of work are employed on farms?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will state exactly what my understanding is.

My understanding is that in Florida the courts have held, and the law has been understood as distinguishing between workers in a packing house or packing shed where the vegetables or fruits are handled in their native state, and the workers in canneries or concentrating plants. My information is that while there has been contention in other States, that contention has been decided by courts of the highest authority in favor of the doctrine which I have announced. That was the decision, as I understand, in the case of the diGiorgio interests in the State of California, only last year. I believe that the adoption of this amendment would tend to upset the decisions of the courts, which announce the law exactly as we have understood and interpreted it in the Florida courts. As I understand, it has been interpreted in both State and Federal courts in that area. The adoption of this amendment would hold in so many words that fruit and vegetable packing-house workers are not included within the term "agricultural laborers," to my mind making a complete and very serious change in existing law. I know that with reference to the Wages and Hours Act there has been great controversy, and it has been decided exactly as I have stated, namely, that there is a difference between those who are actually manufacturing or processing and those who are handling the fruit or vegetables in their native State.

In my judgment, this simple amendment, offered in the best of faith by the distinguished Senator from Arizona might operate completely to overturn the provisions of both the NLRB Act and the Wages and Hours Act and also to overturn the decisions of very eminent courts in interpreting those acts. So I would not want to see it adopted under the understanding that it did not have that

meaning. Let me read the proviso again, for the information of the Senate—

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to interrupt him, the sole question is this: Is a packing-shed worker handling grapefruit, oranges, lemons, carrots, lettuce, or any other crop, alongside a railroad track, not on a farm, putting them in the packages and placing them in the freight car, an agricultural laborer? If the Senator contends that he is, there is no argument about it. But so far as my personal knowledge is concerned, in my own State and in California such workers have not been considered to be agricultural laborers, because they were not employed by a farmer. They did not work on a farm. They engaged in a business. As I have said, most of them are migratory laborers who follow crops.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding has been exactly the contrary. My understanding is that the adoption of this amendment would affirmatively give the National Labor Relations Board jurisdiction over fruit and vegetable workers in packing houses, and also probably bring them within the purview of the Wages and Hours Act. The definition in the Labor-Management Act is one of the specific things affected by this amendment. To my mind, it would be very dangerous to adopt the amendment.

PROPOSED DECENTRALIZATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sorry to have to interrupt with a collateral matter, but I must attend a conference shortly. I shall take not more than 5 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will require only half a minute to dispose of the pending bill if we can reach a vote.

Mr. WILEY. Very well, if it may be understood that I may be recognized. I must attend a conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, have I the floor?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have a couple of insertions to place in the RECORD prior to the passage of the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall consume only a few minutes. I desire to be heard. I think I was recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the most important news in the last 7 days and perhaps of this entire year has been the confirmation by the President of the atomic-bomb explosion within the borders of Russia. To some of us, the only surprising feature of this news is that it, in turn, should cause such surprise. In other words, it has been common knowledge in many circles here in Washington that there was such a radioactive explosion within the Soviet Union.

For example, in the September 1949 issue of the bulletin Intelligence Digest, which was published prior to the 1st of September, by Mr. Kenneth De Courcy, in London, whom I happen to know personally and whom I have had the priv-

ilege of visiting in his home in London and in the country, details were given on the bomb in Russian hands. I personally had made no public reference to this printed news, because quite obviously, until our governmental authorities saw fit to confirm it, it might be considered by some as constituting classified information. In the January issue of the *Intelligence Digest*, to which I have referred, published by Mr. De Courcy, there was a prediction in relation to the explosion.

Yesterday, following the extensive comments on the atomic-bomb question, I released from my office a letter which I had written to Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson urging the decentralization of our armed services from Washington, D. C. I have pleaded for such action for many years now. As a matter of fact, from the early days of 1939, when I first came to the Senate, I pleaded with our military and industrial leaders in Washington to disperse our major defense installations away from the Capital, from New York City, from Chicago, and other over-congested areas out into the relatively under-populated Middle West, and even far West.

To some people, my repeated requests for decentralization from Washington may have seemed to be scaremongering. We have learned, however, that our worst fears have been confirmed and that any further delay in decentralization is suicidal. I tried to point this out in previous articles which I wrote for the magazine the *Reserve Officer* here in Washington in February 1948 and February 1949. At this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the *CONGRESSIONAL RECORD* the text of my release of yesterday.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered, to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

WILEY URGES DECENTRALIZATION TO MEET ATOMIC BOMB THREAT—DERIDES "PEACE TALK WITH STALIN"

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, reported today he had written to Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, presenting his urgent recommendation for immediate decentralization of the National Defense Department, particularly from the Pentagon Building and other "suicidal target" installations in the Washington area.

WILEY also reported that he has renewed his pleas with the White House and the National Security Resources Board for immediate steps for getting as many key Government personnel and officers out of the Washington area as soon as possible.

WE ARE SUCKERS FOR SOLAR PLEXUS BLOW

"Even had President Truman not announced that there has been an atomic bomb explosion inside Russia, such decentralization is long overdue. For years now, I have pointed out that we are 'centralization chumps' in allowing all of our key industries and our key Government departments to be congregated in Washington, D. C., and a few major production centers. We would be a sucker for a solar plexus atomic blow which could knock our country out of an atomic war a few minutes after such a war started."

The Wisconsin Senator added: "While there is certainly no ground for panic or hysteria, there is ground for action—damn fast."

MERE TALK WITH JOE STALIN WILL NOT BRING PEACE

"It is ridiculous to assume that if President Truman were to merely chat with Joe Stalin

and to arrive at some paper agreement that would evaporate away the atomic menace. On the contrary, the atomic cloud will continue to hang over the world, along with the bacteriological warfare cloud, until we have made the United Nations a 100 percent effective international police force. Russia has shown that she regards treaties as mere scraps of paper. An atomic agreement would obviously be kept by her only so long as she felt it within her national interests to do so.

"It is ridiculous too to criticize us for being in an atomic armament race with Russia. It is a fact that such a race exists and will continue. No amount of wishy-washy thinking will eradicate it nor will any so-called peace chat. Our greatest means for preserving peace is still in our invincible armed might, even though we will continue to try to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations."

Mr. WILEY. This morning, after I had issued the release, I received a radiogram from Mr. deCourcy. I should like to read it.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1949.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,

United States Senate, Washington:

Have read your memorandum to Johnson with interest. *Intelligence Digest* published full details coming Russian atomic bomb explosion in January last and said it would be in June. Three weeks ago forecast it had happened. Further information leads me to believe Russia will have big stock pile by 1953 together fleet pilotless aircraft or missiles for use in conjunction. Neither British nor American Governments are adequately informed or taking matters sufficiently seriously. Full information about these matters and plan considered best by those with really full intelligence knowledge is to be published *Intelligence Digest* November 1 which everyone in America should read. Hope you will do best to press these matters and urge people read full details published November upon which the future existence of Britain and America depends. You are quite right about dispersion from Washington though much more than this will be necessary.

Best regards,

KENNETH DECOURCY.

Mr. President, the morning newspaper presents the thought that a ring has been built by the Russians for discharging their projectiles.

My remarks are not made with any thought of indulging in scare propaganda. However, I think we have had long enough to think things through. When we realize what happened in Japan and when we realize how, through our ingenuity, we have shortened distances, so that today from our outpost in Hawaii or our outpost in Alaska it is possible to come in contact with Russian planes and Russian territory within a comparatively few hours, I believe I would be remiss if I did not bring this radiogram to the attention of the Senate, because I happen to know something about the way the man who sent the radiogram operates. It is nothing for him to send a man into a country for an entire year to investigate details. Of course, he has been 6 or 7 months ahead of the rest of the world in respect to certain important data which finally have come to the knowledge of the world. He was weeks ahead of the President's statement.

Mr. President, what are we going to do about this matter? The problem is one which seems to me, as a legislator, to call for a suggestion that perhaps it is later than we think, and that we should care-

fully review the wisdom of the present policy of continually building great centralized establishments, as we have been doing, and building larger and larger cities.

In the issue of *Newsweek* magazine, published this morning, appears a pictogram showing the number of lives that would be lost in one block in New York City if a bomb were dropped there. Yet what are we doing about such matters?

So it seems to me this problem calls, in the first place, for the Armed Services Committee not only to rationalize in regard to the situation but to sit down with the leaders of our military and find out definitely in what direction we are going.

I apologize to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for taking time on this matter during the consideration of the appropriations bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its assistant enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 3616. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird; and

H. R. 3886. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jeanette Pearl Burns.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1976. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 5310. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of California over the lands and residents of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in said State, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5670. An act authorizing transfer of land to the county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, for a hospital site.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 1976. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 3616. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird;

H. R. 3886. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jeanette Pearl Burns;

H. R. 5310. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of California over the lands and residents of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in said State, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5670. An act authorizing transfer of land to the county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, for a hospital site.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6008) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, on page 8, after line 3.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we have a vote on this question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at this time I raise a point of order against the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, namely, that it is an attempt to write legislation into an appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I shall have to concede the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, in line 24, it is proposed to strike out "\$98,500" and insert "\$154,300."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I dislike very much to bring forward an amendment at this particular time, but it so happened that I was in New Mexico up until Thursday of last week. While I was there I took occasion to visit the Pueblo of Zuni, an Indian pueblo close to the Arizona line. There I saw something which I thought I should discuss with the Senate, especially in connection with an appropriation bill.

Several years ago the Congress appropriated funds for a road and a bridge at this particular pueblo. It is the oldest pueblo in the North American Continent, and the first pueblo to be seen by white men. It was discovered by the Spaniards in 1540. Today 3,000 Indians are living there and in the reservation which was granted to them many years ago. They make their own living. During the recent war 800 of these Indians served in the armed forces of the United States.

Congress appropriated money for the construction of a road and a bridge near the pueblo. I went to the pueblo 2 weeks ago last Sunday. In the middle of an arroyo, there is a bridge, but there is no approach to the bridge. That situation exists because, according to what I am told by the Indian Bureau and according to what the poor Indians have tried to explain to me, Congress did not provide sufficient money for finishing the project. The result is that in the middle of the dry arroyo, which is subject to flash floods, there is a fine bridge, a good concrete structure, but it is without approaches. So the Indians cannot cross it.

All I request by the amendment is that a few thousand dollars be appropriated for constructing the approaches to the bridge, so that the Indians may use it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the additional amount the Senator requests, by means of his amendment, is \$50,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is \$54,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This matter was not brought up in the committee; was it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand from the Indian Bureau that the need for the additional funds developed quite suddenly. Of course, the need for the additional construction is so palpable, and the present waste of the Government's money is so evident—anyone who goes there and sees the present situation can

comprehend at a glance the need for the additional funds now requested—that I decided to bring it before the Senate at this time. This matter was brought up before, but I understand that in committee the amount of the appropriation for roads was reduced, with the result that in this particular instance the necessary funds are not available.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the Senator's point that the bridge is finished, but there is no way to get to it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. An automobile cannot be driven on the bridge?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not even possible to walk on the bridge at the present time unless some boards are put in position first so as to enable people to reach the bridge.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it the position of the Senator from New Mexico that the completion of this project is the responsibility of the Federal Government?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly it is the responsibility of the Federal Government, which has built the bridge and has spent the money for its construction. However, even though flash floods continue to develop in the arroyo, the bridge is not usable as of the present time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it the understanding that the Indians will do the labor involved in that connection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Indians usually do.

Mr. President, the situation in the case of that bridge is that the road leading to it has gone to pieces. I am trying to have money made available in order to protect what the Federal Government already has spent on the bridge. It is a very fine project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall not unduly delay passage of the bill. I merely want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on page 8 of the bill we are appropriating \$25,000,000 for the Maritime Commission, as extra money which will be needed to repair 134 vessels now in our national reserve fleet. To keep the record straight, I will place into the RECORD at this point a letter from the Comptroller General indicating why it is that the Maritime Commission now finds it is \$25,000,000 short of the amount of funds adequate to carry out this year's business according to law. This is a letter dated July 11, 1949, signed by the Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, and addressed to the President of the Senate, in which the Comptroller General, referring to the Maritime's expenditure last year, says that "not less than \$25,000,000 must be considered as excessive due to irregular procedures, in-

accurate calculations, and unjustifiably liberal interpretations of statutory language." In other words, Mr. Warren points out in the report attached how the Maritime Commission has disbursed \$25,000,000 for which it had no authority, which is exactly the amount we are today being asked to replace. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 11, 1949.

The HONORABLE THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a special report concerning certain agreements entered into by the United States Maritime Commission under which the Government granted construction subsidies and assumed the cost of national defense features in connection with the construction of passenger vessels for private owners. The information contained in this report was disclosed during the regular audit of the financial transactions of the Commission for the fiscal year 1948 conducted by the Corporation Audits Division of this Office and was brought to my attention in advance of the regular audit report because of the serious nature of the disclosures. I concur, without reservation, in the conclusions and recommendations of this report and feel strongly that the Congress should give immediate attention to the matters discussed therein.

The three transactions in question involve the construction of six vessels at a cost to the Commission of approximately \$150,000,000 and a sale of the vessels to private interests for approximately \$70,000,000. The report indicates that of the resulting contribution of approximately \$80,000,000 by the Government toward the cost of these vessels, not less than \$25,000,000 must be considered as excessive due to various irregular procedures, inaccurate calculations, and unjustifiably liberal interpretations of statutory language.

Respectfully,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,

Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has been interested in this appropriation, I should merely like respectfully to suggest to the Senator from Delaware that the irregularities have nothing to do with the additional request. The additional request comes at this time because of a difference of opinion between the Maritime Commission and the National Military Establishment as to who should pay for conditioning the 134 merchant vessels. Twenty-five million dollars is involved. I do not question Mr. Warren's opinion; I do not question the statement of the Senator from Delaware; but I do say it has no connection with this appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts misunderstood me. I said in the beginning it was not my intention to question the advisability of repairing these vessels. I am merely pointing out why the Maritime Commission finds itself \$25,000,000 short at this particular time and why they do not already have adequate funds to carry out the assignment.

I call to the attention of the Senate another incident, wherein another substantial amount has been ignored by the Maritime Commission. Sometime last spring it was called to my attention that the Maritime Commission had been negligent in billing their outstanding accounts. I was advised that substantial amounts were then outstanding, some of them being past due for more than a year and that invoices for these past due accounts had never been mailed to the debtors. On May 12, 1949, I addressed a letter to the Maritime Commission asking the amount of outstanding accounts owed to the Commission which had not been billed, and also the total amount of such accounts which were 1 year old or over. On May 26, 1949, I received a letter from the Maritime Commission, signed by Mr. Grenville Mellen, Vice Chairman, in which, in answer to my question, he stated:

In February 1949 a survey of unbilled accounts receivable was conducted and it was estimated that these receivables would amount to approximately \$26,000,000.

In March 1949, 50 employees were assigned to the task of screening all backlog accounts in order to identify all receivables contained therein and to effect the necessary billings. All of these accounts are over 1 year old.

Summarizing we find that in February 1949 the Maritime Commission had outstanding on its books over \$26,000,000 which had been owing to the Commission for over 1 year and for which the Commission had never even sent out bills; and again we are told that during the last fiscal year, they paid out in subsidies another \$25,000,000 which, according to Mr. Warren, was based upon inaccurate calculations. I think it is time that the appropriate committee look into the Maritime Commission's affairs and insist upon an accounting for all their expenditures. We should determine just who in the Commission is responsible for such loose management and hold him responsible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the Chair may say the Senate subcommittee on investigations, of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, made the investigation, and that the situation is being corrected very rapidly.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Presiding Officer for that information but I cannot help feeling concerned with the way the Congress continues to appropriate to an agency which is recognized as being out of line in expenditures of the taxpayers' money. I think we should demand an accounting of every dollar spent in this and every other Government agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We had an investigation, and the Maritime Commission made a showing in accordance with what the Senator from Delaware has stated, that they had outstanding accounts in the amount of \$26,000,000, which had not been billed. But with our cooperation, they have placed a large force on it, and they have now reduced the amount so that before very long the bills will all have been sent out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Presiding Officer. But what I was trying to point out to the Senate was that if the Maritime Commission had conducted its affairs in a more businesslike manner the \$25,000,000 appropriation before us would not have been necessary, because the Commission would have had adequate funds at this time, and I personally feel that it would have been better to withhold this appropriation until their house was placed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6008) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

MILITARY PAY BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5007) to provide pay, allowances, and physical-disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have two amendments to call up on H. R. 5007. I wanted to inquire whether those amendments may now be presented. I do not see the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] in the Chamber. I am very anxious for him to be present to discuss the amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps we had better have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has disposed of the appropriation bill for which the unfinished business was temporarily laid aside. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	McCarthy
Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Bridges	Hendrickson	McFarland
Butler	Hickenlooper	McKellar
Cain	Hoey	Magnuson
Capehart	Holland	Malone
Chapman	Humphrey	Martin
Chavez	Jenner	Maybank
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	Miller
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Millikin
Donnell	Johnston, S. C.	Mundt
Downey	Kern	Myers
Eaton	Kerr	Neely
Ellender	Kilgore	O'Connor
Ferguson	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Langer	Reed
George	Leahy	Robertson
Gillette	Long	Russell
Green	Lucas	Saitonstall

Schoeppel	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Utah	Wiley
Sparkman	Tobey	Williams
Stennis	Vandenberg	Withers
Taylor	Watkins	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McClellan in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have two amendments to the pending measure which I desire to have acted on. I send up the first amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(1) All members of the Reserve components heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retirement pay because of physical disability shall be entitled to the same pay, rights, benefits, and privileges provided by law or regulation for retired members of the Regular services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, on July 26, I submitted this amendment.

For many years retired personnel of the Regular services have been extended all rights and privileges enjoyed by members of the active forces. They and their dependents have been (a) permitted to make purchases at commissaries and post exchanges; (b) furnished medical attention and hospitalization; and (c) allowed to travel by Army transport.

It is clearly indicated that when enacting laws providing for the retirement of members of the Reserve components disabled in line of duty Congress intended that all retired personnel should receive the same pay, rights, benefits, and privileges. The Navy did not question this apparent intent of Congress. Retired Reserve personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps have been extended all privileges enjoyed by retired Regulars.

The Army took the position that although the act of April 3, 1939, confers upon officers of the AUS entitlement to receive the same retirement pay as that provided for officers of the Regular Army, such law does not accord to officers receiving retirement pay thereunder all other benefits to which retired officers of the Regular Army are entitled by law or regulation. Retired AUS officers and their dependents were denied hospitalization, the privilege of making purchases at commissaries and post exchanges, and travel by transport, all of which were permitted retired Regulars.

On August 1, 1949, the Army agreed to amend the regulations so as to permit all retired personnel to make purchases at commissaries and exchanges. This reversal of position on the part of the Army places all retired personnel on an equal footing with respect to commissary and exchange privileges. It does not, however, extend to AUS officers other rights and privileges enjoyed by retired Regulars.

My amendment will insure equal treatment for all retired because of disability, and it will prevent discrimination in the future by modification of existing regulations.

Mr. President, I call special attention to the fact that my amendment applies

only to those AUS officers who have been retired because of physical disability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado a question. Does not the amendment of the Senator from Colorado provide that the members of the National Guard or Reserve shall receive the same disability benefits as the members of the Regular Army during the period of active service in time of war or national emergency?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I will read the amendment:

(1) All members of the Reserve components heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retirement pay because of physical disability shall be entitled to the same pay, rights, benefits, and privileges provided by law or regulation for retired members of the Regular services.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up my next amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I understand that the Chair ruled that the amendment was adopted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a question of parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the unanimous-consent agreement it is my understanding that all amendments to the bill are to be voted on at 5 o'clock today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Any amendment that is pending can be voted on before 5 o'clock. Amendments now being offered can be voted upon until 5 o'clock.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I respectfully ask that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was adopted, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered, because I think the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and I both would like an opportunity to discuss the amendment. It is my understanding of the unanimous-consent agreement—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the clerk to read the unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, September 26, 1949, at the hour of 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed to H. R. 5007, the Career Compensation Act of 1949, and upon the passage of the said bill: *Provided*, That no amendment that is not germane to the subject matter of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That the time between 3 p. m. and 5 p. m. on said day be controlled by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and equally divided.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the language "any amendment that may be pending or that may be proposed" is the language which has been used in all other unanimous-consent agreements and that no amendment was to be voted upon before 5 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the unanimous-consent agreement applied only to pending amendments. If the Senator from Massachusetts desires to request unanimous consent to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, the Chair will put the question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do desire that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was agreed to be reconsidered. Is there objection to that request? The Chair hears none, and the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to call up my next amendment, lettered "D," and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 13, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That any disability shown to have been incurred in line of duty during a period of active service in time of war or national emergency shall be considered to be the proximate result of the performance of active duty."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair propound a question to the Senator from Colorado. Does the Senator agree to the postponement of the other amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; until 5 o'clock. My understanding is that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] has an amendment which he desires to offer to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to continue with his first amendment, on which the vote to agree was reconsidered, or does the Senator desire to take up his next amendment, which has just been stated?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. It is my understanding that the present status is that the first amendment I called up is before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And if any Senator has an amendment to it, he should offer it now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the first amendment which the Senator from Colorado offered in connection with National Guard retirements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I do not want to call up another amendment and have such action in effect annul the action on the first amendment. I still want the first amendment to be voted upon.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CHAPMAN. It has been my understanding, and that of every Senator with whom I have discussed this subject, including, I believe, the Senator from Colorado, that these amendments—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may say to the Senator from Kentucky that a gentleman's agreement with respect to the matter existed, but there was nothing official.

Mr. CHAPMAN. The unanimous consent agreement provides—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent agreement deals only with pending amendments, so the Parliamentarian advises the Presiding Officer.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Was not the amendment of the Senator from Colorado the pending amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the pending amendment now, but it was not the pending amendment when the agreement was entered into.

Mr. CHAPMAN. It is my understanding that the unanimous-consent agreement requested by the majority leader the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], provided for a vote at 5 o'clock on the bill and on all amendments pending, and those to be offered in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the agreement related not to a vote on amendments offered in the future, but on pending amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to say so, my amendment was a pending amendment. It was lying on the desk subject to being called up at the time the bill was taken up, so I think it was a pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the situation is that any amendments can be adopted between now and 5 o'clock that are offered from the floor this afternoon or that were pending; that the unanimous-consent agreement provides that at 5 o'clock the then pending amendments and the bill itself shall be voted on.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was present when the majority leader made his unanimous-consent request, and when the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into. The purpose of that agree-

ment, as I understand, was to permit certain Senators who were away from Washington, attending the Midwestern Conference on Agriculture, to come back today, and the hour was set at 5 o'clock so as to allow them to vote on the bill and on all pending amendments at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments which were then pending.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise again to a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the agreement was entered into there were no pending amendments. The bill had been read and there were certain amendments lying on the table, but none had been offered. I think the Senator from Kentucky and I both knew of the proposed amendments of the Senator from Colorado. But they were not then actually offered. They were lying on the table when the agreement was made. If we are going to vote on these amendments now, my question is, Does not that violate the agreement which was made?

Mr. CHAPMAN. It certainly violates the intention.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure that it violates the intention of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it does not make any difference to the Senator from Colorado—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that technically under the agreement any amendment which was pending at 5 o'clock should be voted upon without further debate, together with the bill; but there was no unanimous-consent agreement with respect to any amendment which might be presented before 5 o'clock.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it not be possible under the rules to ask unanimous consent, if that is the understanding, that all amendments which the Senator from Colorado or any other Senator offers shall be voted upon at the same time the bill is voted upon, in order that neither the Senator from Colorado nor any other Senator may lose any rights?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would that include any further amendments which may be offered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator submit that as a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts that all amendments which are pending or which may be offered between now and 5 o'clock be voted upon after the hour of 5 o'clock?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Provided they are germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Provided they are germane. In that event there would be no vote on any amendments until 5 o'clock.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And all such amendments must be germane to the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If that is satisfactory to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, has the unanimous consent request been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not yet. Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr.

President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent agreement proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts is to the effect that no amendments now pending or to be offered, which are germane to the bill, shall be voted upon before 5 o'clock, but that at the hour of 5 o'clock they shall be voted upon, together with the bill, without further debate. Is the understanding of the Chair correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Chair is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—I wish to ask whether or not it will be necessary for any Senator desiring to offer an amendment to my amendment to offer his amendment before 5 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it may be offered after 5 o'clock, but there can be no debate on it after 5 o'clock.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that the unanimous-consent request presented by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is, I am sure, exactly in accord with the understanding at the time the majority leader [Mr. Lucas] submitted his request on Friday afternoon. I am sure that it carries out the original intent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair agrees that that is correct; but it was not in the agreement.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Do I correctly understand the Chair to rule that any other amendments, or amendments to amendments, may be offered up until 5 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Or after 5 o'clock, without debate.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky has the right to offer an amendment at any time, but there is to be no debate after 5 o'clock. If the Senator desires to discuss an amendment before now and 5 o'clock, that is his privilege.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I ask the distinguished Senator from Colorado if the intention of the pending amendment is to extend the benefits and privileges to include post exchanges, commissaries, or comparable agencies? Is it proposed to extend the benefits and privileges to members of the Reserve components on the same basis that they are now extended to retired Regular officers?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Only to AUS officers who have been discharged for disabilities; not to others.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Would that apply to post exchanges, commissaries, or similar agencies maintained by the Military Establishment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Air transport, and everything else.

Mr. CHAPMAN. May I ask the Senator what he means by "everything else" in addition to air transport, commissaries, and post exchanges?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is intended to give them the same privileges Regular officers have.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Does the Senator intend by that to give them the privilege of admission to Army and Navy hospitals, in addition to the privilege they already have of treatment in veterans' hospitals?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If they were retired for disability, they would be entitled to everything a Regular officer is entitled to receive. If a Regular officer, retired, were eligible to go to an Army hospital, an AUS officer, retired for disability, would be entitled to go there too.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I shall probably at the proper time offer an amendment to the amendment just referred to by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MYERS. Has there yet been action by the Senate on the unanimous-consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Massachusetts, which in substance provides that the pending amendment or any other amendments shall be voted upon at the hour of 5 o'clock, together with the bill, without further debate.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senate acted on that request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was no objection, and the Chair held that that would be the order.

Mr. MYERS. I understood that the unanimous-consent request was withdrawn, but if it has been agreed to, I have no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to have the clerk read my second amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The second amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 13, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That any disability shown to have been incurred in line of duty during a period of active service in time of war or national emergency shall be considered to be the proximate result of the performance of active duty."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I submitted that amendment on July 28.

Unless the bill is amended along the lines proposed by me very few members of the National Guard and the Reserve Corps, other than those actually wounded in combat, will qualify for retirement.

Under section 402 (a) a person with less than 8 years' active service could

not qualify for retirement unless it could be established that he is physically disqualified for active service by reason of disability shown to be the proximate result of the performance of active duty.

Persons stricken with tuberculosis, heart disease, or other medical conditions before accumulating 8 years' active service could not qualify, as only on the rarest occasion would it be possible for medical boards to determine that such diseases were the proximate result of the performance of active duty. Inasmuch as the National Guard serves only in time of war or national emergency, and since members of the Reserve Corps accumulate little active Federal service except in time of war or national emergency, only a limited number of the non-Regular personnel will be able to meet the 8-year requirement. Seven years and 11 months will not do. It must be 8 years.

It can be assumed that most members of the Regular services who incur disability resulting from disease will, by the time they have undergone prolonged hospitalization, have accumulated 8 years' service. It will not be necessary for them to show that their disabilities were the proximate result of the performance of active duty. Therefore, it can be said that this bill is discriminatory in favor of members of the Regular services.

Under the terms of the bill a Regular with 8 years' peacetime service may be retired for a medical condition while a non-Regular with 7 years' active war service with identical disability could not be retired.

In other words, if a Regular became afflicted with one of these diseases and spent 4 or 5 years in the hospital he would be eligible, but an AUS officer or a National Guard officer who might have served for 11 years, 11 months, and 20 days in active service, if he became retired, would have great difficulty complying with section 402 (a).

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I agree with the Senator from Colorado in his earnest wish to accord equal rights in these matters to the non-Regular officers and the Regular officers, but I believe the Senator probably will agree with me that that should apply only in time of actual warfare. I am thinking about the fact that the Senator's amendment, as now drafted, would apply, as I believe, to the present period, during which we are technically at war, but are not actually engaged in war.

I would appreciate an observation from the Senator on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, today we are more than technically at war. We have many officers and men in foreign lands—in Germany, Japan, Korea, and other places where they are facing grave dangers. Certainly at the present time we are engaged in more than a technical war.

My amendment reads, in part—

Incur in line of duty during a period of active service in time of war or national emergency—

And so forth. The amendment is confined to "active service in time of war."

I do not know how we could distinguish a technical war from an actual war. If the present situation is called a technical war, although we have men in Korea, Japan, Germany, and even in Greece and Turkey, and in other parts of the globe, I would hate to know what real warfare is.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I think those who have experienced real warfare, as did countless thousands during the recent world war, would think there is a difference between that kind of war and the kind of warfare in which we are engaged at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, Mr. President, during the recent conflict we had more men on the North American Continent than we had off of it. Even while we were fighting an active war, at that time we had a great many men in the United States. So I cannot see the force of that argument.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I would agree with the Senator if the amendment were drafted so as to apply to what is commonly called a shooting war—in other words, to have the amendment provide, as it now reads:

Provided further, That any disability shown to have been incurred in line of duty during a period of active service in time of war or national emergency—

And then insert at that point—

declared subsequent to the date of enactment of this act—

And then follow with the remainder of the Senator's amendment—

shall be considered to be the proximate result of the performance of active duty.

I would heartily agree with that kind of an amendment. At the proper time I shall probably offer such an amendment to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as I said a few moments ago, it can be assumed that most members of the Regular services who incur disability resulting from disease will, by the time they have undergone prolonged hospitalization, have accumulated 8 years of service. It will not be necessary for them to show that their disabilities were "the proximate result of the performance of active duty." Therefore, it can be said that this bill is discriminatory in favor of members of the Regular services.

Under the terms of the bill, a Regular with 8 years of peacetime service could be retired for a medical condition, while a non-Regular with 7 years of active war service, and with identical disability, could not be retired. It seems to me that is a rather complete refutation of the arguments presented by the able junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Would not the 7 years' requirement apply to a Regular officer in the same way that it would to an officer who was not a Regular?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, Mr. President, the way a Regular officer would handle that kind of a situa-

tion would be as follows: He would go to a hospital and would stay there 1 year, or 2 years, or 5 years, until he had accumulated his 8 years; and then he would retire and would receive the retirement benefits. That is the way such a situation would be handled.

Under section 402 (a) of the bill, as reported from the Committee on Armed Services, members of the uniformed services would not fare as well as would Foreign Service officers and civil-service employees. A civilian employee may be retired for disability after 5 years' service, and he is not required to show that the disqualifying disability was the proximate result of the performance of his duties. The act of August 13, 1946, provides that any Foreign Service officer who, after a total of not less than 5 years' service, becomes incapacitated for useful and efficient service by reason of injury or disease not due to vicious habits, intemperance, or willful misconduct on his part, shall receive an annuity equal to 2 percent of his average basic pay for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 30 years. This law provides that if the officer has had less than 20 years of service at the time of his retirement his annuity will be computed on the assumption that he had 20 years of service.

This amendment would make eligible for retirement all members of the armed forces determined to be unfit for active service by reason of line-of-duty disability ratable not less than 30 percent under the Veterans' Administration system of rating.

There is no logical reason why a National Guard man or a member of the Reserve Corps with over 7 but less than 8 years' active service, who develops tuberculosis or other disease while in active war service, should be treated less favorably than a member of the military forces with 8 years peacetime service, or a civilian employee with 5 years' service.

The original emergency officers retirement act of May 24, 1928, required that the disability for which retirement was granted resulted directly from "such world war service." The Economy Act, Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, required that the disability resulting from disease or injury be shown to have directly resulted from the performance of military or naval duty. In each case, the disability had to be 30 percent or more permanently disabling and incurred in line of duty.

There is practically no difference in the requirements of these two acts. In fact, many experts contend the original act is more restrictive. Under the original act, some 7,000 emergency officers were retired. Under the Economy Act, all but approximately 1,500 were removed from the retirement rolls. This was brought about by the difference in interpretation of the two acts and the regulations promulgated by the Veterans' Administration requiring the showing of a causative factor. Under this causative factor requirement, those disabled by disease, regardless of whether

it was incurred in combat, had to show that but for their world war service the disability would not have occurred, and in injury cases they had to show that they were acting under competent orders at the time the disability was received.

House bill 5007, as reported to the Senate, requires—in addition to a showing of 30 percent permanent disability incurred in line of duty—that the Regular, Reserve, or National Guard officer with less than 8 years' active service to show that the disability was the "proximate result of the performance of active duty." This requirement could be given the same interpretation as the language used in the Economy Act of 1933, and would practically eliminate all Reserve and National Guard officers' disability retirement, unless the disability was combat-incurred.

Congress should use definite language, such as that contained in this amendment, and should not leave the interpretation to the whims of the service departments.

Mr. President, let me say that I have received, with respect to this amendment, the following letter from the Disabled American Veterans:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., September 22, 1949.
The Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSON: We of the DAV were gratified to know of your suggested amendment to H. R. 5007 which would insert in line 13, page 36 the language:

"Provided further, That any disability shown to have been incurred in line of duty during a period of active service in time of war or national emergency shall be considered to be the proximate result of the direct performance of active duty."

Under the terms of section 402 (a) few persons, other than those with specific injuries or combat wounds, could qualify for disability retirement. Such a plan might be fair and result in no injustices in time of peace when the duties of military personnel are comparable to the activities of persons engaged in civil pursuits. In normal times it is generally known what a soldier or sailor is doing and adequate medical records are made and retained. However, in time of war a large percentage of armed services personnel undergo terrific physical and mental strain, satisfactory medical records are not always prepared, and frequently records are lost or destroyed in combat. Under the terms of the bill a person with less than 8 years active service could not qualify for disability retirement except upon a determination that the disqualifying disease or injury resulted directly from the performance of active duty. Generally speaking, members of the civilian components and junior officers of the regular services will have less than 8 years' active Federal service. Therefore, it can be said that, except for those wounded in action or injured in training, officers and enlisted men who fight our wars and who incur line of duty disability will be put out of the service with severance pay of a few hundred dollars. Few, if any, who develop tuberculosis, various types of heart disease, nephritis, etc., will qualify for retirement pay under section 402 (a) for only on the rarest occasion would it be possible to make a determination that a disease resulted directly from the performance of active duty.

XCV—835

The following will illustrate the unfairness of the proposed legislation: A enters service upon declaration of war and serves throughout the period of hostilities with a combat unit. A year later, while still in active service and serving with occupation forces, he is found to have developed tuberculosis. After hospitalization over a period of many months he is ordered before a retiring board. He has over 7 but less than 8 years' service. Therefore, it must be determined whether his disability resulted directly from the performance of active duty. Medical authorities know that the disease had its inception after his entrance into active service and some time before it was detected. However, they do not know the cause and, therefore, are unable to say that it resulted directly from the performance of active duty. Although totally disabled by reason of line-of-duty disability, he will be denied retirement benefits.

B enters service in peacetime and his duties are not particularly strenuous. During a tour of duty at the Pentagon Building he is found to have some form of heart disease. B has been in service for approximately 7 years at the time he is sent to the hospital. He is kept in the hospital for more than a year, or until he has accumulated 8 years' service and then goes before a retiring board. Being credited with 8 years' service it will not be necessary for B's heart condition to be determined to have resulted directly from the performance of active duty. A determination that his disability was not caused by his own misconduct and that it is not less than 30 percent will entitle him to disability retirement.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Very sincerely yours,

F. M. SULLIVAN,
Director for National Legislation.

It is to remove such discriminations in the bill that my amendment is offered. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter addressed to the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], signed by E. A. Walsh, major general, National Guard, president of the National Guard Association of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., August 15, 1949.
Hon. ZALES N. ECTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ECTON: The National Guard Association is in full agreement with many of the recommendations of the Hook Commission, and has gone on record in favor of the passage of the service pay bill, H. R. 5007. However, we do desire to see the bill amended in order that Reserve and National Guard officers on active duty will receive fair treatment in cases of disability incident to active service. It is recalled that the Hook Commission specifically recommended that the principle of equal treatment between corresponding grades of various services and between sexes, as well as between Regulars and Reserves, be followed. Notwithstanding this definite recommendation on the part of the Hook Commission, those gentlemen who have been interested in drawing this piece of legislation have previously violated the principle enunciated above, since under section 402 it is found that members of the Reserve component are not given equal treatment with members of the Regular or professional establishment. We therefore urge you to support an amendment offered by Senator JOHNSON of Colorado, which reads as follows:

"On page 36, line 13, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: 'Provided further, That any disability shown to have been incurred in line of duty during a period of active service in time of war or national emergency shall be considered to be the proximate result of the performance of active duty.'"

In like manner, we urge you to include a second amendment which would add a new subsection to section 402 to read as follows:

"(1) All members of the Reserve components heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retirement pay because of physical disability shall be entitled to the same pay, rights, benefits, and privileges provided by law or regulation for retired members of the Regular services."

These two amendments will go a long way toward protecting the Reserve officer who may suffer physical disability because of active service. I submit that they are entitled to be fairly treated, and I respectfully request your support of the two amendments quoted above.

Sincerely yours,

E. A. WALSH,
Major General, National Guard,
President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD copy of a letter written June 16, 1934, 15 years ago, signed by many of the then Members of the Senate who are still Members; and by many other Senators who are no longer with us, including Pat Harrison, William E. Borah, Carl Hatch, and Hugo Black. I want to read three paragraphs of the letter. It was addressed to the President, the White House. It seems to me the three paragraphs are very much in point in the consideration of the pending bill and of the amendments which I have offered. I read from the letter, as follows:

We are not asking to restore to the emergency officers' list the name of any officer who did not receive his disability in line of duty. We respectfully submit, however, that the regulation requiring the showing of a "causative factor," plus the definition of "causative factor," as one arising from the performance of a specific military duty, is far more restrictive than any Congress had in mind when passing this legislation. It is a requirement impossible to meet in many worthy cases, including practically all cases of functional disease.

What they said then is true today.

Surely, where it is a well-established fact that an officer was seriously disabled by injury or disease while in the service during the war, and that the disability existed to such a severe degree that upon discharge, or soon thereafter, he was rated 30 percent permanently disabled by the Veterans' Administration, these conditions should meet any restrictions which the Government would be justified in requiring to fulfill the intent of the act.

We most earnestly request that Regulation No. 5 and Veterans' Administration Instructions issued pursuant thereto, be changed so that retirement privileges may be continued for those whose disabilities are clearly shown to have been incurred in line of duty while in the active military or naval service during the World War, the Government reserving the right to rebut evidence submitted for the substantiation of such claims.

The letter was signed, as I have said, by many distinguished Senators. I ask unanimous consent to make the letter a part of the RECORD.

Without objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
June 16, 1934.

To the PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We respectfully direct your attention to section 10, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, Veterans Regulation No. 5, and Veterans' Administration instructions to review boards charged with adjudication of emergency officers' retirement claims.

Under the original Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, emergency officers who served during the world war and who had a permanent disability of more than 30 percent incurred in line of duty and found to have resulted directly from such world-war service were retired at three-fourths of their base pay. Section 10 of Public, No. 2, provided that those emergency officers who had a 30-percent disability, incurred in line of duty, would be entitled to continue to receive retirement pay if the disability resulted from disease or injury directly resulting from the performance of military or naval duty. While it is admitted that the language of the act of March 20, 1933, was intended to be more restrictive than the original act, as interpreted, it is our opinion that the Veterans' Administration in the interpretation of the language of section 10, Public, No. 2, has gone far beyond the intent of the Congress. This is evidenced by the estimate of those in charge of the bill that section 10 would result in the saving of approximately \$3,000,000 while, as a matter of fact, the saving effected was more than twice this amount.

Section 10 of the act of March 20, 1933, does not contain the words "causative factor" but these words were used in Veterans Regulation No. 5 and Veterans' Administration instructions. Even had they been used in the act it is our belief that the interpretation placed on them by the Veterans' Administration is unwarranted.

Veterans' Administration instructions to review boards charged with adjudication of emergency officers' retirement claims and appeals for continuation of retirement benefits reads in part as follows:

"In addition to the determination that the injury or disease which resulted in the disability for which retirement has heretofore been granted was incurred in line of duty, it must also be determined that the disease or injury or aggravation of the disease or injury directly resulted from the performance of military or naval duty. In making this determination it is required that the officer show a causative factor arising out of the actual performance of duty.

"A disease of mind or body which arises merely in point of time with service, that is, while employed in the active military or naval service, is not sufficient to bring the officer within this requirement. It must be shown that but for the performance of actual duty the injury or disease could not reasonably have been expected to have arisen. The breaking down or degeneration of tissues which might be expected irrespective of the unusual stress or strain incident to the performance of actual military or naval duty, will not be considered a causative factor.

"* * * The disease or injury must be traceable directly to, and the causative factor must directly arise out of, a duty being performed under competent orders. Officers injured while not carrying out duties incident to orders will not be considered as performing military or naval duty during such period."

Acting under the above instructions the boards in the original review of emergency officers' cases eliminated practically all disease cases, notwithstanding the fact that

they were found to have been incurred in line of duty and directly connected with their war service and are now being paid compensation for their war-incurred disabilities. Injury cases were denied continuation of retirement benefits where they were unable to show that they were acting under some specific order at the time the injury was incurred, notwithstanding the fact that it was found to have been incurred in line of duty by Army or Navy officials.

The Veterans' Administration claims that this drastic requirement was the intent of Congress, and point to the fact that the words "causative factor," although not in the act, appear in the report of the Finance Committee of the Senate. These words were undoubtedly supplied by officials of the Veterans' Administration, but no explanation was ever made to the committee as to how the words would be interpreted. No member of the Senate Committee on Finance, nor of the Congress, could have had any conception at the time of the passage of the act that such an interpretation would be made. It is this arbitrary interpretation by the Veterans' Administration which has caused most of the existing hardships.

We are not asking to restore to the emergency officers' list the name of any officer who did not receive his disability in line of duty. We respectfully submit, however, that the regulation requiring the showing of a "causative factor," plus the definition of "causative factor," as one arising from the performance of a specific military duty, is far more restrictive than any Congress had in mind when passing this legislation. It is a requirement impossible to meet in many worthy cases, including practically all cases of functional disease.

Surely, where it is a well-established fact that an officer was seriously disabled by injury or disease while in the service during the war, and that the disability existed to such a severe degree that upon discharge, or soon thereafter, he was rated 30 percent permanently disabled by the Veterans' Administration, these conditions should meet any restrictions which the Government would be justified in requiring to fulfill the intent of the act.

We most earnestly request that regulation No. 5, and Veterans' Administration instructions issued pursuant thereto, be changed so that retirement privileges may be continued for those whose disabilities are clearly shown to have been incurred in line of duty while in the active military or naval service during the World War, the Government reserving the right to rebut evidence submitted for the substantiation of such claims.

Sincerely yours,

Robert R. Reynolds, Tom Connally, Pat McCarran, Morris Sheppard, Elmer Thomas, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., Chas. L. McNary, Hiram W. Johnson, Bronson Cutting, Pat Harrison, Borah, Carl A. Hatch, Hugo L. Black, Duncan W. Fletcher, A. H. Vandenberg, W. Warren Barbour, Henry F. Ashurst, B. Wheeler, Elbert D. Thomas, Lynn Frazier, Arthur Capper, Gerald P. Nye, Henrik Shipstead, James Couzens, James J. Davis, E. W. Gibson, David I. Walsh, M. W. Logan, Frederick Steiwer, Walter F. George, Edward P. Costigan, Bennett Champ Clark, Alben W. Barkley, Richard B. Russell, Carl Hayden, H. D. Stephens, Geo. McGill, Augustine Lonergan, Jos. T. Robinson.

MR. MYERS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment D, and ask that it be read.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. GEORGE in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 4, beginning with the word "shall," it is proposed to strike out all down to and

including line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "are hereby assigned to the various pay grades prescribed for warrant officers in subsection (a) of this section, as follows:

Pay grade:	Assignments
W-4----	Commissioned and chief warrant officers having over 26 cumulative years of service; and warrant officers having over 30 cumulative years of service.
W-3----	Commissioned and chief warrant officers having over 20 cumulative years of service; and warrant officers having over 26 cumulative years of service.
W-2----	Commissioned and chief warrant officers having less than 20 cumulative years of service; and warrant officers having over 20 cumulative years of service.
W-1----	Warrant officers having less than 20 cumulative years of service.

MR. MYERS. Mr. President, all the amendment seeks to do is to place warrant officers, so far as defining their pay status is concerned, in the same category as commissioned personnel. Representative PAT SUTTON, of Tennessee, appeared before the Senate Committee on Armed Services in behalf of the amendment, and read a rather lengthy statement. I commend the statement to Members of the Senate. I think he covered the subject. I may say also that he appended to his statement before the Armed Services Committee a memorandum dealing with the amendment, which points out very clearly the need for such an amendment. I do not intend to burden the RECORD by reading Representative SUTTON's statement, but I do want to refer briefly to it, and to the memorandum, both of which are part of the committee hearings. In his statement, these words were contained:

Under the proposed bill as it stands, unlimited discretion is given the secretary of the department involved to distribute warrant officers to the four pay grades prescribed. While it should be understood that no intimation of unfairness in such distribution is intended by us, nevertheless the possibility exists that at a time when funds run short and desperate measures must be taken to conserve funds, such steps might be absolutely imperative as economy measures, but might also be financially distressing to the warrant officers concerned and their families. When a commissioned officer gets a rank he knows he is going to be paid in accordance with that rank because he has been assigned a pay grade by Congress, under the terms of the bill. It works in almost the same way with the enlisted men for whom classes are set up exactly paralleling the grades of enlisted personnel, even though there is reserved to the secretary the discretion to distribute all enlisted men to the pay grades prescribed. A casual perusal of the pay schedule for enlisted men shows that the grade E-7 would in all probability be assigned to chief petty officers, grades E-6 and 5 and 4 to petty officers of the first, second and third classes; the grades E-3 and E-2 to the seamen and privates first and second class and the other two remaining grades to recruits with more than 4 months of service and less than 4 months' service respectively.

The warrant officers, appear to have no secure provision for assignment to grade. From the House Armed Services Committee, as of June 6, 1949, the following compilation indicates that in the commissioned officers ranks covering all services, more than 15

percent of the commissioned officers have been by law assigned to the upper half of the pay grades, namely, grades O-8 to O-5, both inclusive. This compilation further reveals that warrant officers who have been distributed administratively to the upper half of their pay grades, namely, W-4 and W-3, by reason of an unlimited grant of discretion to the secretary, amount to less than 1 percent of the total number of warrant officers in all of the services.

Thus it is found that almost 25,000 commissioned officers of a total of 174,000 are in the upper half of the grades for commissioned officers, while 112 of a total of 14,400 warrant officers comprise the upper half of the pay grades for warrant officers.

All that this amendment seeks is to afford to those warrant officers who have more than 20 cumulative years of service behind them a distribution to pay grade by Congress rather than by the executive branch of the Government. Upon analysis it will be found that a fair and clean line of demarcation has been fixed and that for the warrant officer who has service amounting to 20 years, the lowest grade is assigned.

Let me summarize, Mr. President, what this amendment, which I offer, will do if it should be enacted into law.

First. Commissioned officers are assigned to pay grades by the act. The moment a second lieutenant or an ensign is commissioned Congress, by this act, insures his assignment to the proper pay grade.

Second. The assignment of warrant officers to pay grades is left to the unbridled discretion of the Secretary.

As a result of Executive assignment of these officers to pay grades the current status of these officers is:

W-4	-----	10
W-3	-----	102
W-2	-----	7,238
W-1	-----	7,000

Third. The contribution of warrant officers to the armed services needs no comment. When war comes, 80 to 90 percent of them are immediately commissioned, due to their qualifications and experience.

Fourth. Under present practices less than 1 percent of the warrant officers are in the upper half of the pay grades prescribed by Congress. More than 40 percent of the enlisted personnel enjoy the upper half of enlisted pay grades. More than 15 percent of the commissioned officers are in the upper half of officers' pay grades.

Fifth. The amendment keeps all warrant officers in the lowest pay grade until 20 cumulative years of service have been given; and prescribes the next to the lowest pay grade for chief warrant officers with less than 20 cumulative years of service.

Sixth. The top pay grade is not reached until after chief warrant officers have more than 26 cumulative years of service and until warrant officers have more than 30 cumulative years of service.

So, Mr. President, this amendment does no more for warrant officers than the act already does for commissioned officers. Congress assigns the pay grades rather than the Secretary of the department concerned.

I think common decency and justice to those men who have rendered such

great service to their country in time of war and in time of peace demand the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If I correctly understand the Senator's amendment, it gives promotions to warrant officers on the basis of length of service rather than on the basis of efficiency.

Mr. MYERS. I do not think that is altogether correct. As I have said, 80 or 90 percent of warrant officers were commissioned in World War II. Congress has given them some assurance of their pay to commissioned officers. Warrant officers are treated differently. The matter is left entirely to the discretion of the Secretary. I believe they should be treated on the same basis as are commissioned officers.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator, if he will permit me, that this is a very technical bill, but, as I understand, the whole theory of the bill is to get efficiency into our military service and to make a military career worth while. The Senator from Pennsylvania has said that the commissioned officer has assurance and the warrant officer has no assurance. As I understand, the commissioned officer who, by his efficiency, goes steadily up the line, receives an advantage, but the officer who does not show himself efficient will have his pay leveled off and will not get an opportunity to go ahead. As I understand, it is the same with a warrant officer. The Senator has said that there is a very small percentage of men in the warrant-officer grade. I am informed that the reason for that is that the Army and the Air Force are just getting going, so to speak, on the subject of making warrant officers, and they have not had an opportunity to get men into that grade on the basis of efficiency.

My question is, if this bill gives the same opportunity for a warrant officer to get to the top of grade 4, is not that better than placing him on a length-of-service basis and eliminating efficiency from warrant officers while we are trying to attain it in the commissioned officers?

Mr. MYERS. A Representative from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] who appeared before the Armed Services Committee, brought up in his testimony the Hook Commission Report. As a matter of fact, he telegraphed the members of the Hook Commission as follows:

Please advise if you would recommend today the same pay scale as was contained in the original Hook Commission Report to the Secretary of Defense in 1948.

Representative SUTTON indicates that each member of the Commission very graciously acknowledged his telegram separately, and they were unanimous in their opinion that the recommendation set up in the Hook Commission Report should be adopted.

It is interesting to note, Representative SUTTON said, that on page 6 of the Hook Commission's Report on career compensation for members of the armed

services, very well-defined recommendations were made for the allocation of specific warrant officers to specific pay grades.

Mr. SUTTON stated before the Senate Armed Services Committee as follows:

That Commission recommended the inclusion of commissioned warrant officers with over 20 years of service, in the Marine Corps, Navy, and Coast Guard, and specially designated chief warrant officers of the Army and Air Force in the top grade for pay purposes. The amendment before you does not go this far with respect to the chief warrant and commissioned warrant officers—it requires that they have over 26 years of service before the top grade is provided. With respect to the second highest pay grade, the Hook report suggests inclusion of commissioned and chief warrant officers with over 10 years of service. Again this amendment does not even go that far, but for this classification, provides over 20 years of service as being requisite for that grade. The Hook report places chief warrant officers and commissioned warrant officers with less than 10 years service in the third highest pay grade. The amendment provides that all chief and commissioned warrant officers with less than 20 years service go into this grade.

I think we can find some support for this amendment in the Hook Commission Report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MYERS. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Was the Senator's amendment submitted to the full committee?

Mr. MYERS. My amendment was not, but Representative SUTTON offered an identical amendment before the Armed Services Committee. Whether it was before the subcommittee or before the full committee, frankly, I cannot say; but this specific amendment was brought to the attention of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that this amendment was brought to the attention of the full committee.

Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MYERS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator's position on this amendment be affected if he had reason to believe or understood that the status of warrant officers was going to be the subject of legislation next year with relation to providing the same degree of opportunity with reference to warrant officers as now obtains with reference to commissioned officers? I am informed by one of the experts of the House Armed Services Committee that one of the reasons it was left as it was, and the Senator's amendment was rejected in the House committee, was that it froze a situation that would make it impossible to give opportunities for warrant officers in further legislation.

Mr. MYERS. I am not altogether sure that I would agree with the statement that it would deprive warrant officers of those opportunities. This subject was also discussed by Representative SUTTON before the Armed Services Committee, and he said this—and I must agree with

his statement; I think he answered the question very well at that time:

I realize that the drafters of this bill maintain that they are working on a measure to take care of the warrant officers later. Why later? Are we going to enact this bill, and then, in the next breath, ignore certain provisions contained therein and do a lot of wrangling over a warrant officers' bill? Why not treat all branches of the service alike and include everybody in this one bill?

I agree with him when he said:

Personally, I can see no reason for all of this procrastination over the provisions pertaining to warrant officers.

The committee had the matter before it for some time, and I certainly think the Department could have come before the committee with its recommendations as to warrant officers, and incorporated the entire matter in one paper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 3 o'clock having arrived, the time between now and 5 o'clock is equally divided, and under the control of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me 5 minutes?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the armed services pay bill which is before the Senate most equitable and justified. It provides an adjustment of pay for the armed services which has long been overdue.

In the case of the armed services, it is essential that the key officers in the Defense Establishment be kept in the service rather than be allowed to retire or leave for other occupations, because after all this country cannot maintain a huge standing Army, a huge Air Force, or a huge Navy. We must depend upon having trained personnel in our officer classification and our key enlisted classification, and depend upon Reserve units, and our ability to call into service in time of emergency men to fill out the ranks. I voted for the bill in committee, and I intend to vote for it on the floor of the Senate.

I have offered for consideration an amendment which I think has a great deal of merit. I offered one a few days ago, and offered a substitute for it today. I should like to read it, and then make a brief explanation. It provides for adding at the end of the bill a new section to read as follows:

SEC. 534. The head of each department or independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, having personnel subject to the provisions of this act, is authorized and directed to absorb the increased costs during the fiscal year 1950 resulting from the enactment of this act within any unobligated or unexpended balances in appropriations available to such department or independent agency. For the purposes of the foregoing, in cases where current appropriations have not yet become law, the fiscal year 1950 appropriations shall be considered to be the lesser of the amounts passed by the Senate or House of Representatives as of September 26, 1949.

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment when it was drafted was to

have the armed services absorb, without further cost to the Government, the pay raises which are included in the pending bill.

The situation now is that we have in conference between the House and the Senate the armed-services appropriation bill. There are differences of opinion on various matters, and one of the differences is as to the amount. The amount included in the Senate bill is very substantially under that in the House bill. Then there is another matter which must be taken into consideration, namely, that the President in submitting his budget to the Congress set up an item of some \$400,000,000 for military-pay increases.

My first thought was to press for my amendment in this authorization bill. After conferring with various Senators, particularly with some of my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations, I thought probably the sound action to take would be for me not to offer the amendment or press for it, but to let the matter be worked out in conference between the House and the Senate in the consideration of the appropriation bill, wherein the Senate has reduced the amount of the appropriation substantially, and the Secretary of Defense is under general direction from the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to make certain substantial over-all reductions in military spending.

If the armed services then came forward with a supplemental or deficiency appropriation to cover something beyond the regular appropriation, and another amount to cover the figure in the pending bill under the authority of President's budget, wherein he recommended \$400,000,000 for this purpose, because of the lateness of the time I think the matter should be settled as I have indicated.

For this reason, Mr. President, I shall not offer or press the amendment which I have prepared, although I think the amendment is constructive and sound. But on consideration and study—and I have given much attention to the matter today—I think it can be settled and should be settled on an appropriation bill rather than on the pending authorization bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who, like the Senator, is a member of the Armed Services Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, and having heard the discussion in both committees, I am heartily in accord with what the Senator has in mind. But if my memory serves me correctly, it seems to me that the Senate Committee on Appropriations put back the full amount of the President's budget, and inserted an amendment providing that the Secretary of Defense should reduce the budget by approximately \$312,000,000. The amount involved in this authorization is \$274,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. So that it comes within the amount by which the Senate has ordered the Secretary of Defense to reduce. That perhaps may

mean that he will not be able to reduce other items by \$312,000,000, but at this moment it seems to me to be a matter to be settled in connection with the appropriation rather than to be handled on an authorization bill. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do; it seems to me it should be handled in connection with the appropriation bill. I have seen so many cases where it is said, "If we authorize something, we are under obligation to appropriate." I do not want to get into that category, but, on the other hand, I think that because of the technical situation between the House and the Senate, and in view of the original budget, it would be sound to work the proposition out and reach a solution on the basis proposed.

Apparently the Department of Defense has given the Committee on Appropriations, after considerable study, an indication that they intend to make substantial reductions, and do it forthwith. I do not care to see the matter complicated by my amendment, yet I should like to see the general objective carried out.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington will vote in support of the military pay bill for two primary reasons.

I am advised that the proposed pay increases will reasonably equalize the rates of pay as they will prevail between the Military Establishment and other executive branches of the Government. This ought to mean that the Military Establishment will attract adequate personnel in the future, and that those who prefer service in the Military Establishment will not feel required to seek employment in other branches of the Government because of a material difference in the pay scales for comparable assignments.

My second reason, Mr. President, for supporting the pending bill is nothing more than a hope at this time, but a good hope, which I trust will be realized in the near future. Most Senators probably know that the Military Establishment provides free medical care and treatment for the dependents of military personnel. No fees are charged for this service, which covers most of the families of a present military strength of about 1,500,000 men and women in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Most Senators probably know that free medical care and treatment is not provided for the dependents of those who are employed by other branches of the Federal Government.

If the military pay bill is approved there is reason to believe that the vast majority of military personnel will be able to pay a reasonable fee for the medical care and treatment which is to be required by their dependents.

Mr. President, I know that serious thought is being given at this time by the medical services branch of the Military Establishment to this problem of dependent care. I think that legislation will be submitted to the Congress in due time. We ought to be conscious, I think, of this

question as we take action on the pending bill.

Everyone seems to agree, Mr. President, that our Military Establishment is short of qualified medical personnel. I know that consideration has been given to the drafting of doctors and dentists.

The most obvious reason for the shortage is the work load which is imposed by the dependent-care situation. I think it is reasonable to suggest that the prevailing work load would be cut fully in half if the dependents of service personnel were placed on a reasonable fee basis. If the work load were substantially reduced there would be no need for increasing the medical personnel of the Military Establishment, and a draft of such personnel would be totally unnecessary.

Should free medical care be continued by the Military Establishment we ought to be clearly aware of what appears to be an undeniable fact, namely, that it would not be possible for the Military Establishment to provide adequate care and treatment for its personnel in the event of a national emergency.

Now is the time to anticipate the requirements of an emergency by establishing a fee basis for the treatment and care of the dependents of military personnel. The approval of the pending bill will encourage the Military Establishment to recommend dependent-care changes which are long overdue.

I thought, Mr. President, the Senate might be concerned with these observations which justify my approval of the pending measure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] is absent at the moment on a conference committee. I believe that neither he nor I know of any further speakers on the pending measure, except himself and myself, and I believe neither of us will require not more than 15 minutes apiece. I hope we may be permitted to present what we have to say at half past 4 rather than to do it now. So, Mr. President, I have no further speaker to offer at the moment.

RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. I move the Senate stand in recess until 4:30 o'clock p. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 4:30 o'clock p. m. today.

On expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Vice President.

MILITARY PAY BILL

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5007) to provide pay, allowances, and physical disability retirement for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that half an hour is left for debate, the

time to be divided by the Senator from Kentucky and myself. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the pending measure, the Army pay bill, is an extremely technical bill. It is very hard to understand.

The bill has been very carefully worked out. It began as an aftermath of the pay increases of 1946, which were designed to induce men to enlist in the Army. After those pay increases went into effect, it was recognized that in some respects great unfairness existed in the old pay scales, which had not been revamped for a long period of time. So Mr. Forrestal and Mr. Patterson got together and approached the President about the matter.

As a result, when Mr. Forrestal was made Secretary of Defense, all the data which had been accumulated were referred to him, and he referred them to the so-called Hook Commission. That Commission worked for a period of more than a year, and submitted a report on which the pending bill is based.

As I see the bill, which is long and complicated, it will do three things, if it is enacted: First, the bill will put the military forces on a career basis. It will give an inducement to a man to perform his duty well and earn promotions. The present law does not relate pay to responsibility, incentive, or ability. For instance, at the present time a brigadier general, a colonel, and a lieutenant colonel with 30 years' service get the same pay. We know that in the present circumstances, particularly in view of the information in regard to atomic energy which was given to us last week, leadership in our military forces is vital. First of all, it will save the lives of our boys and girls in the future, if there ever is another war. In the second place, we are told that we have approximately \$75,000,000,000 invested in our armed defenses. So we want leadership to take care of a large investment of that character. In the third place, we are spending approximately \$15,000,000,000 a year on our armed services, and of course, we want efficiency and quality of leadership in order that the Nation may be served well in the expenditure of that vast sum of money.

It has been argued that this bill is for "the brass" alone. I should like to point out that since 1908, some 41 years ago, recruits have received 400-percent advances in pay; first grade enlisted men, 116 percent; second lieutenants, 57 percent; majors, 14 percent; and major generals, 11 percent. So the increases in pay since 1908 have gone substantially to the enlisted men.

Second, this bill for the first time extends to enlisted men the same physical disability retirement as that applying to officers.

Third, the bill places enlisted men on a par with officers for travel allowance.

Fourth, the bill gives enlisted men quarters allowances as soon as they reach the grade of corporal with 7 years of service or as soon as they reach the grade of sergeant, regardless of service.

Fifth, the bill will give enlisted men foreign-service pay, although it will take away such pay from officers.

Mr. President, if Senators wish to give only a quick glance at the bill, they will find the nub of the entire bill on page 9.

The bill provides for physical disability retirement on equal terms for all on active service. It does not concern itself with voluntary or involuntary retirement, inasmuch as provisions dealing with such retirement were deliberately left out of the bill for further study. In other words, the bill provides disability retirement pay for enlisted men and officers alike, but does not touch the present law in regard to voluntary or involuntary retirement.

If the law now proposed were in effect today, the retirement cost for officers would be 50 percent less than it is at the present time. That is so because under the law here proposed, disability will be on a graded basis, whereas at the present time all disability is on the basis of 75 percent of the regular or normal pay.

Another thing the bill does is to provide for a phasing out or progressive reduction of the wartime family allowance, replacing the family allowance with a permanent quarters allowance, payable only to enlisted men in the higher grades. The bill puts officers on a ration, on a monthly basis, rather than on a daily basis, and the officers' ration is limited to officers alone. The family allowance, so-called, was a wartime measure which went into effect during the war because we were drafting men at that time, and we had to draft family men as well as single men. So the family allowance was adopted at that time. It was never intended to be retained as permanent law. As I have said, it was intended to cover draftees. This bill would gradually phase out or progressively reduce the family allowance, and would put it on a quarters-allowance basis.

Mr. President, those are the three principal things the bill does, namely, first, provide for pay increases on an efficiency, merit basis; second, provide for physical disability retirement for officers and men alike; and third, provide for a phasing out or progressive reduction of the family allowance, which was a wartime measure, set up a quarters allowance, and put officers on a ration basis in a monthly amount.

As a consequence of those changes, and incidental to them, if you will, the bill will cut the total amount required for hazard pay. It will reduce somewhat the submarine and airplane allowances, but it will not eliminate them.

The cost of the bill will be \$274,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950, commencing October 1, 1949; for 1951 it will be \$348,000,000; for 1952 it will be \$318,000,000; and in 1953 the cost of the bill will level off at \$304,000,000. That will be the net increase in cost for personnel which will accrue as a result of the enactment of this bill. I use the word "net" because certain items will be reduced by the bill, such as the family allowance, hazard pay, and several other items.

Mr. President, this bill is an effort to bring order out of the present crazy quilt of our pay system. The bill presents a new pattern. It has had very

careful consideration, first by the Hook Commission, then by the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and then by the House Committee on Armed Services, from which it was reported to the House, but the House recommitted it for further study by its Committee on Armed Services. Finally, it was reported once more by the House Committee on Armed Services and passed by the House in substantially its present form. The Senate Committee on Armed Services worked for several months over the bill. We went through it line by line, really word by word. We hope we have made some improvements in the bill as it was passed by the House.

As all of us realize, at the present time this country has a world responsibility. So, we have a responsibility to keep strong militarily, to keep strong economically, and to maintain our way of life. One of the most important and most essential things for us to do at the present time is to keep up our military strength, so that we shall be respected as a world power. Today we want good men in our armed forces, just as we want good men in our various civilian jobs.

So far as I know, three amendments have been submitted. I believe there is a fourth, with which I am not familiar. The three amendments which have been submitted, two by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and one by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], I hope will all be defeated.

Amendment "D", as offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] provides that in time of war or national emergency every disability incurred in line of duty should be regarded as the proximate result of the actual performance of active duty. As worded, the amendment covers disabilities arising from disease as well as those arising from an injury. The Armed Services Committees in both the House and the Senate considered this identical amendment at considerable length during their executive meetings, and both committees took an unfavorable view of the proposition.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee I can assure you that the most painstaking effort was made to see that every individual who incurs a service-connected disability will receive prompt and reasonable compensation. We feel that the bill as it is now written provides a very adequate protection. Further, we feel that this protection is geared to wartime as well as peacetime. We also feel that it treats the Regular and non-Regular in identically the same fashion. The argument that the 8-year requirement in section 402 (b) is discriminatory, has been refuted in detail by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN]. He has pointed out very clearly that the Regular and non-Regular receive identically the same treatment.

The committee was most critical in its examination of this entire bill to insure against any possible discrimination among the various components of our armed forces, Regular or non-Regular, whether serving voluntarily in time of peace or inducted into the service in time of war. I would be the first person to

oppose any slightest shadow of discrimination of this type and it is my considered opinion that the bill as it is now written provides a reasonable and just compensation for all forms of service-connected disability, regardless of the component of the individual, or whether the country is at peace or war. I do not feel that the contention advanced to the committee by the proponents of this amendment, that in the future only persons incapacitated as a result of an injury will receive disability compensation, has the slightest factual support.

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] lettered amendment "E" is a most appealing proposition. On the surface, it seems simply to provide that retired Regulars shall not receive any benefit not given to retired non-Regulars. Those who originally sponsored the amendment before the committee pointed out that it would give the non-Regular retired individual post exchange and commissary privileges. That point of course, is no longer an issue, since beginning October 1 the new regulations for post exchanges and commissaries specifically provide this form of equality. However the amendment as written goes much further, in that it would authorize AUS officers, certified to the Veterans' Administration for retirement privileges, to go to Army and Navy hospitals, dispensaries and other medical installations. We all insist, of course, and agree, that our disabled service personnel must have the very best hospitalization the Nation can provide. I do not feel that it is the intent of this amendment to imply that our Veterans' Administration hospitals are not providing adequate care, or that the amendment is necessary to insure better medical care; and certainly there was not any claim advanced by the proponents of the amendment that Veterans' Administration hospitals are unsatisfactory. Also, there is no objection to permitting Veterans' Administration and service hospitals to continue to allocate beds to one another, as is now being done, on a space-available basis.

However, as the Senate is aware, hospital beds in Army and Navy hospitals are provided by the Congress primarily for the care of active-duty personnel. At the present time there is a very serious shortage of doctors and dentists in the military service. As a result, service hospitals are today actually unable to provide much of the medical care which it has been their custom for many years to give. The effect of this amendment would be to extend these already overcrowded facilities to some 30,000 additional patients. This amendment was previously considered by the committees both in the House and Senate, and rejected on the basis that it is unwise at this time to subject our military hospitals to this additional load. I would like to take issue with one point which has been made this afternoon. It has been argued that the adoption of this amendment would really not be particularly meaningful, inasmuch as these facilities would be granted only if space were available. I for one am completely unwilling to accept this philosophy. If the Congress grants a "privilege" of using

any Government hospital, whether military or nonmilitary, it is to be assumed that we will at the same time accept the responsibility of seeing that these hospitals are available. Otherwise we are making what is virtually an empty promise.

The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] applies to the grade of warrant officer. With regard to that amendment I may simply say it is my understanding that at the present time the two top grades of warrant officer are new to the Army and the Air Force. They have very few men in those grades. They are getting more men into them. They are working out systems and qualifications for the grades. I am informed it is expected to bring in a bill on this subject at the next session of Congress, only 3 months hence. If we agree to the amendment, we shall thereby freeze the law regarding warrant officers, and we shall put warrant officers back, as I understand, on levels which will be computed on length of service alone. It eliminates the whole theory of efficiency and merit in our armed services. Mr. President, I hope that amendment will also be rejected. I trust therefore that the bill, which is extremely technical, and which has been very carefully worked out, will be passed without amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, has the Senator time remaining in which to answer questions?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have 1 minute more. I shall be glad to try to answer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the second amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado, which the Senator from Massachusetts described, would Reserve officers and guardsmen have the use of hospital facilities for any disability other than that incurred in line of duty?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say in answer to the Senator's question that an officer of the non-Regular components who is injured in line of duty while serving on active duty is entitled to hospitalization at Army installations. However, if he is separated from the service and thereafter incurs a disability he may go to the Veterans' Administration hospitals. I should point out that if the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] should prevail, the procedure which I have just referred to would not be disturbed.

Mr. AIKEN. Suppose he falls downstairs in his own home and breaks a leg; does he then have the benefit of the veterans' hospital?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He would get the same rights then in a veterans' hospital that any other veteran would have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] yield about half a minute for the purpose of enabling me to offer an amendment?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have sent to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill, it is proposed to insert the following:

Any member who, on the effective date of this act, is a hospital patient and who within 6 months of the effective date of this act, is retired as a result of a physical disability growing out of the injury or disease for which he was hospitalized as of the date of the enactment of this act, may elect to receive benefits computed under the laws in effect on the date preceding the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have reviewed this matter with one of the Senators in charge of the bill and he appears perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference. The purpose of the amendment is to give an officer who is now in a hospital as a result of injury or disease an opportunity to make his final settlement either under the terms of the present law or under the terms of the new act. There could be no material difference, but there might be a trifling difference in favor of the officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Does the Senator desire more time?

Mr. BUTLER. I think I have made a sufficient statement.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska submitted the amendment to the consideration of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Kentucky, and both of us have assured him we are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAPMAN. The other amendments—there are three which have been printed—we hope the Senate will defeat. The able Senator from Massachusetts, who has made a magnificent contribution not only to the consideration of this subject and the drafting of the bill in committee but also to its presentation on the floor of the Senate, has already summarized the principal points in the bill, and I shall not repeat any discussion of those points.

I discussed them at some length last Friday, with the assistance of the able Senator from Massachusetts and of other Senators who were on the floor. I feel sure that the justice and equity of the bill will be recognized by the votes of Members of this body, and I hope that the bill will be passed without any amendments, except the one just offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

We consider the pending measure as a part of the great scheme of national defense, that it fits into the pattern of the planned defense of our country along with other important measures already adopted by the Senate, some of which have become law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Senator now saying he is opposed to the amendments I offered a short while ago?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am not opposed to them, with the suggestion I made to the Senator from Colorado, that if he would accept an amendment—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot accept an amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Then, the Senator from Kentucky is opposed to them. I shall discuss those amendments between now and 5 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator from Kentucky has amendments to offer to my amendments—

Mr. CHAPMAN. I shall offer them, provided the Senator will accept them, but he says he cannot do that, and so I shall not offer them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is not for the Senator from Colorado to accept amendments. It is for the Senate to do that.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Our position on the post exchange and hospital amendment to which the Senator from Massachusetts ably referred is that we believe it goes much further than its proponents have claimed in discussing it with the committee, and, in fact, that it would be highly discriminatory.

Not only does it deal with post exchange privileges, but it extends to hospitalization as well. We have no objection to extending the same privileges to the post exchanges. In fact, we are, we believe, reliably informed that beginning October 1 the same rights and privileges will be extended to all branches of the service, so far as the post exchanges and commissaries are concerned. We see in the amendment much confusion and very great expenditure of public funds, because, as I interpret the language of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, it would extend the facilities of Army and Navy hospitals to 32,300 officers who now have the benefit of treatment in veterans' hospitals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. My amendment does not give to AUS officers who are retired anything which the Regular officers do not have at the present time. I am sure the Senator knows that a retired Regular officer cannot go to an Army hospital unless there are sufficient beds there. If he applies, he is sent to a veterans' hospital, unless the hospital to which he applies has facilities for taking care of him. Under no other circumstances will such a hospital accept a Regular officer, and under no other circumstances will it accept an AUS officer.

Mr. CHAPMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator. He explained that in his former statement this afternoon. My time is rapidly moving on toward 5 o'clock.

The amendment would add 32,300 officers as additional patients who would have the right to go to Army and Navy hospitals—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAPMAN. I cannot yield. My time is limited—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Not a right to go, but a privilege.

Mr. CHAPMAN. A privilege. We shall not quibble over terminology. If we should now adopt the amendment, how, then, could Congress, when the next session convenes, refuse to extend the same privilege to 1,600,000 enlisted men? The result would be indescribable confusion as well as an additional and great burden of expense to the Government, because we would be duplicating in the Navy and Army hospitals a service already being rendered by the veterans' hospitals. We would have a confused pattern. A large number of men could ask for admittance to Army and Navy hospitals, and that is where Congress would meet its next problem, because it would be necessary to build new hospitals and to provide additional thousands upon thousands of beds for those men upon whom would be conferred by the Senator's amendment this new privilege. Veterans' hospitals are provided for their needs, and Army and Navy hospitals for the Regulars.

As to the other amendment which the distinguished Senator has offered, Mr. President, the bill as written would apply equally and fairly to both Regular and non-Regular officers. There would be no discrimination whatever between the two classes. If I could see the slightest chance of discrimination in favor of a Regular officer as against a non-Regular officer in that respect, I would ardently support the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado. But it does not discriminate. The amendment would completely set aside one of the fundamental changes which this bill proposes to make in the retirement procedure. So long as it is fair and just to all it is carrying out the purpose for which it is intended. The committees of the House and the Senate have labored on this subject for several months during this session of the Congress.

I shall not go further into detail, because the hands of the clock will not permit me. I want to speak briefly regarding the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], which is known as the warrant-officer amendment. This proposal was considered by the House Committee on Armed Services and by the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and was rejected after a thorough examination of its merits.

It proposes to deal with warrant officers purely on the basis of length of service and with absolutely no regard to efficiency. To that extent it would completely set aside the entire philosophy of the labor of the Hook Commission and of the Committees on Armed Services. We must gear promotion and pay to efficiency and responsibility, and not merely to length of service.

Furthermore, the adoption of the amendment would make the pay scale for warrant officers, shown on page 9 of the bill, completely meaningless, in that an individual could not possibly reach a higher grade, regardless of his efficiency, until he had completed a fixed amount of service.

Senators are familiar with the functions of warrant officers. They are men

who come into the service and who have specialties, who are proficient in special lines of work, and are worth a great deal more to our country if appointed warrant officers, so they can engage in work for which they have been trained and in which they have had experience, than they would be if given rifles and packs on their backs as private soldiers. On the other hand, they are men who do not have academic training or the educational preparation to receive commissions in the Army. One of those men might in a very short time demonstrate such aptitude, ability, and capacity for work in his specialized calling that it would be wrong to keep him near the bottom of the list until he had been in the service for 26 or 28 or 30 years. On the other hand, he might be appointed a warrant officer because of the specialty in which he is supposed to be proficient, and he might never prove to be any more proficient than at the beginning of his enlistment. It might work a great disadvantage to the service of our country if this amendment were adopted.

Mr. President, the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses held exhaustive, thorough, and careful hearings on this important subject. They have viewed it as a part of a great defense system which we believe must be built as the surest preventive of war. It is not just a cost-of-living increase in pay. Every section of the bill, which I discussed in detail last Friday, is designed to contribute to that consummation so devoutly to be wished, that we shall have the greatest defensive military machine the world has ever seen.

I hope this bill, with the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], will be passed, and that all the other amendments will be rejected. I speak for a large majority of the committee when I make that appeal to the Senate.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hoey	Miller
Anderson	Holland	Millikin
Bridges	Humphrey	Morse
Butler	Ives	Mundt
Byrd	Jenner	Murray
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Chavez	Kem	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kerr	Robertson
Donnell	Kilgore	Russell
Douglas	Knowland	Saltonstall
Downey	Langer	Schoeppel
Ecton	Leahy	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
Ferguson	Lucas	Stennis
Fulbright	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
George	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Gillette	McFarland	Tobey
Green	McKellar	Watkins
Gurney	Magnuson	Wiley
Hayden	Malone	Williams
Hendrickson	Martin	Withers
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], which has been stated.

Mr. LANGER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and

Mr. AIKEN voted in the affirmative when his name was called.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. A Senator has answered his name on the roll call. For what purpose does the Senator rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I have two amendments, and it is hard to tell which one we are voting on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, between lines 4 and 5, it is proposed to insert the following new subsection:

(1) All members of the Reserve components heretofore or hereafter retired or granted retirement pay because of physical disability shall be entitled to the same pay, rights, benefits, and privileges provided by law or regulation for retired members of the regular services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will continue the roll call.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). Present.

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). Mr. President, I ask to be excused from voting on this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Pennsylvania will be excused from voting.

Mr. MCCARTHY (when his name was called). Mr. President, in view of the fact that I am a Reserve officer, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Wisconsin will be excused from voting.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on this vote I ask to be excused from voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Washington will be excused from voting.

Mr. JENNER (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, I am recorded in the affirmative. I ask unanimous consent that I may vote "present."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator will be excused from voting.

Mr. HENDRICKSON (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, as a Reserve officer, I ask leave to withdraw my vote, and to be excused from voting.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON (after having voted "present"). I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting. I had voted "present."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My colleague the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], is absent by leave of the Senate. If he were present he would vote "yea" on the pending amendment.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business with leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 15, as follows:

YEAS—50

Aiken	Holland	Mundt
Anderson	Humphrey	Murray
Bridges	Ives	Myers
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Chavez	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Donnell	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Downey	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	McKellar	Tobey
George	Malone	Watkins
Gillette	Maybank	Wiley
Hayden	Miller	Williams
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Young
Hoey	Morse	

NAYS—15

Byrd	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Russell
Douglas	Leahy	Saltonstall
Green	Long	Stennis
Gurney	Lucas	Withers

NOT VOTING—31

Baldwin	Eastland	Hill
Brewster	Flanders	Hunt
Bricker	Frear	Jenner
Cain	Fulbright	Kefauver
Connally	Graham	Lodge
Dulles	Hendrickson	McCarran

McCarthy
McMahon
Magnuson
Martin
Pepper

Reed
Smith, N. J.
Taft
Taylor
Thye

Tydings
Vandenberg
Wherry

So the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment lettered "D."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 4, beginning with the word "shall", it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 6 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "are hereby assigned to the various pay grades prescribed for warrant officers in subsection (a) of this section, as follows:

Assignments

Pay grade:

W-4----Commissioned and chief warrant officers having over 26 cumulative years of service; and warrant officers having over 30 cumulative years of service.

W-3----Commissioned and chief warrant officers having over 20 cumulative years of service; and warrant officers having over 26 cumulative years of service.

W-2----Commissioned and chief warrant officers having less than 20 cumulative years of service; and warrant officers having over 20 cumulative years of service.

W-1----Warrant officers having less than 20 cumulative years of service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up my second amendment lettered "D."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, line 13, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That any disability shown to have been incurred in line of duty during a period of active service in time of war or national emergency shall be considered to be the proximate result of the performance of active duty."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert:

Any member who, on the effective date of this act, is a hospital patient and who within

6 months of the effective date of this act, is retired as a result of a physical disability growing out of the injury or disease for which he was hospitalized as of the date of the enactment of this act, may elect to receive retirement benefits computed under the laws in effect on the date preceding the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN] make a statement respecting my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No debate is in order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 5007) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, as it was passed by the Senate, be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

LOOSE SECURITY POLICIES IN CONNECTION WITH ATOMIC ENERGY PROGRAM

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the announcement by the President last Friday that Russia had produced an atomic explosion is, of course, ominous news. It means that now at least two major countries in the world will be able to use atomic weapons. We have realized at all times that Russia, or some other countries, would eventually produce atomic weapons, unless reliable world controls were established. The time table has been a matter of dispute, but it was inevitable that without world controls these weapons would, in time, become available to other nations.

Now, in advance of most predictions, an atomic explosion has occurred in Russia. This announcement completely emphasizes one of the vital objectives of my investigation now being conducted in this field. I have constantly stressed over the past 2 years, and especially during the investigation, the vital necessity for the highest degree of security in our own atomic-energy program. I have repeatedly emphasized that security in our atomic program has been treated with indifference.

I have shown that, while the Atomic Energy Act sets up rigid requirements

for investigation by the FBI of all employees in atomic energy prior to their employment with access to restricted or secret data, during the past 2½ years this provision has been disregarded by the Atomic Energy Commission. More than 4,000 persons have been employed with access to restricted data without first having been investigated by the FBI. There have been a number of cases in which later investigation, after weeks of employment, has shown employees to be very doubtful security risks.

This policy has provided perfect opportunity either for infiltration by espionage agents or for the employment of persons who are susceptible to the very clever influence of espionage agents. These loose security policies, without doubt, also have resulted in many cases in the disappearance of, or failure to account for, important materials and data in several of our atomic plants.

We must realize that it has been repeatedly announced from official circles that the atomic-energy project has been Russia's No. 1 espionage target. As early as 1943, Russian agents have been working to secure all possible information about our atomic-energy program and processes.

While a number of factors no doubt combined to enable Russia to produce an atomic explosion much in advance of the generally predicted timetable, nevertheless, it is certainly reasonable to believe that these loose security policies of the Atomic Energy Commission have permitted vital information to filter out of this country. I have no doubt that they have helped step up by a very substantial period of time Russia's timetable for the production of an atomic explosion.

I have been repeatedly accused of seeing ghosts around every corner by those who pooh-pooh security, but I have been hoping that through adequate security we could delay as long as possible the time when some other nation would be able to make a bomb, and that in the meantime reliable world control might be established. In fact, the very specific and rigid security requirements set up in the Atomic Energy Act itself were designed with that very protection in mind.

With this news, however, we have a fact which we must face. It means that the world simply must find a reliable method for control of atomic weapons or eventually face a great world catastrophe.

I earnestly hope that this news will cause the Atomic Energy Commission to change certain of its policies and stimulate more vigorous and realistic development of atomic energy. We are, of course, still preeminent in the atomic energy field, but we should be. We must redouble our efforts to increase this leadership, and the world must redouble its efforts to find a solution for peace.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before Senators leave, I remind them that some have evidently forgotten that we are about to proceed to consider the Executive Calendar and take up the nominations of Mr. Butterworth and others. I make that announcement because we may be here for some time, and there

may be a yea-and-nay vote. I hope all Senators will remain.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the able majority leader yield to me at this point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am prepared to go ahead with some remarks on Mr. Butterworth's nomination. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois wishes to have the nomination considered as in executive session, or whether he wishes the Senate to go into executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to have the nomination considered in executive session.

However, before we go into executive session, I wish to say that, as Senators know, last week I advised the Senate that we would take up one pay bill after another until they were finished. However, there has been some opposition to House bill 1689, a bill to increase the rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies. Senators who are opposing that bill are now in conference with members of the committee reporting the bill, with the hope that a proper and fair substitute may be placed before the Senate.

I feel that the so-called executive pay bill should be next in order after the military pay bill. Consequently I shall ask tomorrow that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar from the beginning. A number of Senators have been asking me when the calendar would be called, and I have told them that it would be called at some convenient time. I believe that that will be the proper time to call the calendar. Following the call of the calendar we shall then take up Calendar No. 886, which is the so-called executive pay bill.

Mr. President, with that brief announcement I move—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the absence of the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY], I have been asked concerning the farm bill. Some members of the minority may not be present the latter part of the week. They are very much interested in the farm bill. When does the majority leader plan to bring it up?

Mr. LUCAS. The moment we finish the pay bills it is planned to bring up the farm bill, irrespective of what Senators may be absent. It is impossible to accommodate all Senators with respect to various measures. In almost every instance when it is sought to bring up a certain measure one or more Senators say, "Can you not delay it a little while? I expect to be absent from the Senate. I have an important speaking engagement, and I should like to have consideration of the bill delayed." I should like to accommodate all Senators, but we are now getting pretty close to the end of the session. As soon as we finish the pay bills we expect to bring up the farm bill. It is my understanding, from those who should know, that we should not be required to spend more than a day on the farm bill, because I think all Senators are for it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the pay bills will come up in order after the call of the calendar tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished majority leader advise us as to the order in which the pay bills are to be taken up?

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps we shall proceed next with Calendar No. 875, Senate bill 1772, which is the bill reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service dealing with additional benefits for certain postmasters and others in the postal service. I think the Senator from North Dakota is very much interested in that particular bill. I can assure Senators that as soon as we complete action on the executive pay bill we shall take up the post office pay bill, and then probably the Classification Act pay bill, one after another. So there will be no question that every Senator will have an opportunity to consider and debate all the pay bills.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, about the present understanding in regard to the program tomorrow. There was some confusion in the Chamber at the time when the announcement was made, and I am not entirely clear about it. Will the calendar be called the first thing in the session tomorrow, after the Senate assembles?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, and we shall start from the beginning of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank the Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of W. Walton Butterworth, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. A number of Senators have inquired whether we might be able to obtain unanimous consent to vote tomorrow, at 1 o'clock, on the nomination

of Mr. Butterworth and also on the nominations of Mr. Austin, Mr. Jessup, Mrs. Roosevelt, and Mr. Cooper to be Representatives of the United States to the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, and also on the nominations of Mr. Compton, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Fahy, Mr. Hickerson, and Mrs. Rohde, to be alternate representatives. I wonder how the Senator from California feels about such a suggestion.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to agree to have that done, with the voting to start at 1 o'clock. However, there may be other Senators who would not be willing to have such an agreement entered.

Mr. LUCAS. I say to the Senator that I will stay here today just as long as any Senator may wish to have the Senate remain in session, in order that debate on these nominations may proceed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it the understanding that, in the event such an agreement is entered, the calendar will be called immediately following the vote at 1 o'clock?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So such an agreement would provide a full hour for consideration of the nominations, prior to the call of the calendar tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois propose that as a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, Mr. President; I propose that as a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator please restate his request?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow at 1 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination of W. Walton Butterworth, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of State, and, following that, on all the nominations which have been made by the President as representatives of the United States of America to the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, including also the nominations of alternate representatives; and that the time between 12 o'clock and 1 p. m. be divided between the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], respectively.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The only issue I am raising is on the nomination of Mr. Butterworth. So far as I am concerned, I do not oppose confirmation of the other nominations.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; but the Senator can control the time, regardless of that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out to the majority leader, most respectfully, if I may do so, that the proposed agreement, if entered,

would provide 1 hour tomorrow for the consideration of all the nominations, whereas it seems to me 1 hour should be confined to consideration of the nomination of Mr. Butterworth.

I have not conferred with the Senator from California; but it seems to me that it is possible that if the Senate were to take up the other nominations at this time, before taking up the Butterworth nomination, they could be disposed of rather rapidly; and then the Senator from California could debate tomorrow the nomination of Mr. Butterworth, and the debate at that time could be confined to that nomination.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator from Massachusetts to state that he would like to have the Senate proceed now to consider the other nominations?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota has very brief remarks to make in that connection, and that then the nominations can be voted on and disposed of.

Mr. LUCAS. If that course will be acceptable to the Senator from California, certainly it is agreeable to me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is agreeable to me, unless by so doing I would lose my right to the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will not lose his right to the floor, under such circumstances.

But I assume that the Senator from North Dakota would like to speak first.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to speak for less than 1 minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations as representatives or alternate representatives of the United States of America to the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the nominations to be considered and voted on en bloc; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; that is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc.

The nominations considered en bloc are as follows:

Warren R. Austin, of Vermont, Philip C. Jessup, of Connecticut; Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt, of New York; and John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, to be representatives of the United States of America to the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Wilson M. Compton, of Washington; Benjamin V. Cohen, of New York; Charles Fahy, of New Mexico; John D. Hickerson, of Texas; and Mrs. Ruth B. Rohde, of New York, to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that when I objected the other day to the consideration of these nominations at that time, I did so in order that I might bring forcefully to the attention of the Senate the treatment Germany had received at the hands of the United Nations and the lack of effort

in behalf of Germany on the part of the representatives of the United States.

Since then, I have been in consultation with one very distinguished member of this group of nominees, and I am satisfied that that attention will be given to Germany.

I wish further to say that I consider the nomination of John Sherman Cooper, of the State of Kentucky, to be one of the very finest which could have been made.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the other day the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously approved a series of nominations for members of the group comprising United States membership to the General Assembly of the United Nations. I should like to take just a few moments to speak on the splendid qualifications of one of the nominees, our former colleague, the honorable John Sherman Cooper. While I am devoting my attention to him, I would not, of course, in any way detract from the splendid record of his conominees, whose nominations now are before the Senate for confirmation.

Those of my associates who had the pleasure of serving with John Cooper during the Eightieth Congress need hardly be told that here is a man of whom the Blue Grass State and all the United States may, indeed, be proud. The nomination of former Senator Cooper to serve at Lake Success is a splendid demonstration of bipartisan foreign policy on the part of our Democratic President.

John Cooper, we all know, has a distinguished judicial and military career by way of background, in addition to his service in the Senate following the special election in November 1946. John Cooper, who was born in Somerset, Ky., but 48 years ago, served various terms as county judge and circuit judge in Kentucky. In 1942, he enlisted in the United States Army. He received his commission as second lieutenant a year later. He served with the Third Army from July 1944 in Normandy, France, Luxembourg, and Germany.

After the close of the war he served at Munich in the reorganization of the German judicial system. He was discharged as a captain of the United States Army in February 1946. An able lawyer, a keen thinker, a warm personality, a sincere man with a humble approach to life, a deeply religious man—these are but a few of the well-deserved descriptions which come to mind when I mention the name, John Cooper.

I had the pleasure of knowing this distinguished Kentuckian very closely because of his service on the Senate Judiciary Committee during the period of my chairmanship in the Eightieth Congress. No one who followed the work of that group can fail to remember the yeoman service which he unstintingly performed in connection with such matters as the Portal-to-Portal Act and literally dozens of other important bills affecting the Nation's court system and its laws. I came to appreciate at first hand John Cooper's fine legal abilities, but more important than that, I appreciated the statesmanship of his approach. There was nothing of the partisan in him.

John Cooper, while a loyal Republican, analyzed all issues, as each of us should, from the standpoint of the national welfare. That is why in his voting record in the Senate he gained the commendation of Republican and Democrat alike.

He is well qualified to serve at Lake Success in the position left vacant by another great Republican and American, our able colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. DULLES]. Senator Cooper has seen the problems of Europe at first hand. He has seen the problems of international law. He has seen the meaning of war and why the United Nations must succeed in preventing a third terrible conflagration.

I am sure his nomination will be unanimously approved by my colleagues. It is but one point in a great career in which Senator Cooper will win increasing honors for his State, his Nation, and himself.

The State of Kentucky has a long list of distinguished sons of whom it may be proud, but in the future annals of the Blue Grass State the name of John Sherman Cooper shall have a high and most honored place, as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations, and in many other important capacities, which I am sure he will fill.

Mr. President, there is a little story which I think those who knew John Cooper will recall. The story came to me when I was visiting in Kentucky. Here was a man whose integrity reached down into the very roots of his being. The story is told of his father's having incurred debt. John Cooper, the young lawyer, assumed payment of that obligation. He bent his back and dug. He had no obligation to pay the debt of his father, except through his inherent sense of what was right. That is the thing, above all else, that should characterize a public servant.

I am happy because I learned to love John Cooper. I found him to possess a keen mind, a lofty appreciation of what was legally right and morally right; and never did he hesitate to throw himself wholeheartedly into his work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of representatives and alternates to the United Nations? The nominations will be voted on en bloc.

The nominations were confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

NOMINATION OF W. WALTON BUTTERWORTH TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request with respect to Mr. Butterworth, of Louisiana, only. It is to the end that a vote be taken on the nomination at 1 o'clock tomorrow; the time to be divided as I suggested a few moments ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand it is agreeable to the Senator from

California and to the Senator from New Hampshire, who are particularly interested.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, may I ask the majority leader whether that automatically postpones the call of the Legislative Calendar until 1 o'clock?

Mr. LUCAS. Until 1 o'clock; that is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, today the Senate has before it the nomination of Mr. W. Walton Butterworth to be Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. His nomination was reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee on June 22.

Frankly it is with considerable regret that I find I must oppose the nomination of Mr. Butterworth for this particular office. On my several meetings with him I have found him to be courteous. When I have requested information which he felt able to give it was always supplied very promptly.

My objection to Mr. Butterworth is that he has occupied a position of responsibility in dealing with far eastern affairs at a time when our American policy was following a course leading to disaster for the people of China and perhaps ultimately for the people of the United States.

On the 15th of May 1946, approximately 10 months after VJ-day, when we and our allies had together won the greatest war in all history, Mr. Butterworth arrived in China. His appointment originally called for him to be consul at our embassy at Chungking, but as the capital had moved by that time to Nanking he went directly there and also held the honorary rank as minister.

He was in China from early 1946 to July 1947 at a time when John Carter Vincent was Director of the Division of Far Eastern Affairs. Presumably Mr. Vincent had something to do with the assignment of key personnel in China at this critical period.

He returned to the United States to become Director of Far Eastern Affairs on September 15, 1947. Since that time he has served in that capacity and is relinquishing that position to become Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, if his nomination is confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. Butterworth has held the position as Director of Far Eastern Affairs during the period of time the State Department was following the policy of "wait until the dust settles" and while communism was making its greatest inroads.

He was holding a responsible position in China during part of the time General Marshall was there as a special emissary of the President of the United States urging the Nationalist Government to take the Communists into the government on a coalition basis. It is only fair to state that it was General Marshall and not Mr. Butterworth who handled most of the negotiations with the Chinese Government seeking to accomplish this

directive from the President of the United States.

He held the position as Director of Far Eastern Affairs at a time when the Congress, despite State Department disapproval and lack of interest, took the initiative in providing funds for economic and military aid to China under title 4 of the ECA Act of 1948.

While this bill passed both Houses of Congress and was signed by the President on April 3, 1948, the first arms shipments did not reach China until November of that year after some of the most crucial battles in Manchuria and north China had already been fought.

At a time when we should be and presumably are seeking a new far-eastern policy, bipartisan in character, there has been nominated to the key position of Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs the man who has, as Chief of the Far Eastern Division during the past several crucial years, been in effect the receiver for our bankrupt policy in that part of the world.

I do not blame Mr. Butterworth for all the errors of omission or commission for there are others in high and low positions who must help shoulder that responsibility. But he was and is the responsible head of the section of our State Department which must accept the criticism or credit for what was done. We cannot expect inspired leadership for a new far-eastern policy from this source.

In view of the President's atomic announcement of Friday, September 23, may God grant there is time to rectify, in part at least, the Asiatic debacle now in the making even while we meet here today.

Boldly and affirmatively we have developed and maintained a foreign policy in Europe. In many of its aspects it has originated or developed as a result of Republican consultation and support. The world knows what that policy is. In my opinion it has the overwhelming support of the American people. It is to help maintain freedom against communism, the most tyrannical and brutal force with which the world has had to contend. It is to support a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world will be secure against aggression, whatever its source.

In China we have had no similar bipartisan foreign policy. To be brutally frank, for the years since the close of World War II we have had no policy that could command the respect or support of the Congress and the Nation.

We have vacillated all over the lot. We have attempted to interfere in China's internal affairs by attempting to force a coalition with the Communists. We have done this subsequent to the time when it was clear that coalition with communism is unworkable except as a means of facilitating complete Communist domination.

The more I have studied the China white paper and the documents left out of it, the less satisfaction I have, as a citizen of this country and as a Senator of the United States, relative to what we have done and what we have failed to do.

With great reluctance I say that our record in China during the past 4 years is

not one in which this or future generations of Americans can take pride.

We have broken our word time and time again, we have abandoned a friend and ally in need and we have contributed to the disaster of allowing China, with her 470,000,000 people, to be almost overwhelmed by militant communism, knowing full well that if all of China falls there is little that can be done to save southwest Asia or perhaps the entire continent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should prefer not to yield until the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. NEELY in the chair). The Senator from California declines to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We have done this in the face of repeated warnings from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, Admiral Badger, Ambassador Hurley, former Ambassador Bullitt, Generals Wedemeyer and Chennault, as well as many other competent observers.

How much part Alger Hiss played in the shaping of our conduct in China, I do not know. He was present at Yalta, he was associated with the Far Eastern Division for a part of the time he served in our State Department; nor is it clear how much influence the visit of Vice President Henry Wallace to China in June 1944 had on later decisions. Wallace was accompanied by John Carter Vincent, at that time the Chief of the Division of Chinese Affairs of the State Department.

Have all Senators read the letter of resignation of Ambassador Hurley sent to President Truman on November 26, 1945? It can be found on page 581, annex 50, of the China white paper.

I shall ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks. Here is what is said by a man with a distinguished career in service to the United States. He served and had the confidence of three Presidents and of Secretaries of State Hull, Stettinius, and Byrnes. Nor are they the remarks of a man who has been removed from office for he had been asked to return to China as the American Ambassador.

Listen to what he says in his letter of resignation to the President:

I am grateful to both you and the Secretary of State for the support you have given me and for your kind offer in requesting me to return to China as Ambassador.

In one capacity or another I have been on the perimeter of America's influence since the beginning of the war. During the war I have served in Java, Australia, New Zealand, and generally in the Southwest Pacific, in Egypt, Palestine, the Lebanon, Syria, Transjordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Iran, Russia, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, and China. Of all of the assignments China was the most intricate and the most difficult. It is a source of gratification to me that in all my missions I had the support of President Roosevelt, Secretary Hull, Secretary Stettinius, yourself, Mr. President, and Secretary Byrnes.

In the higher echelon of our policy-making officials American objectives were nearly always clearly defined. The astonishing feature of our foreign policy is the wide discrepancy between our announced policies and our conduct of international relations. For instance, we began the war with the prin-

ciples of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. Our associates in the war at that time gave eloquent lip service to the principles of democracy. We finished the war in the Far East furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. Inasmuch as I am in agreement with you and the Secretary of State on our foreign policy, I think I owe it to you as well as to the country to point out the reasons for the failure of the American foreign policy in reaching the objectives for which we said we were fighting the war.

I continue to read from Ambassador Hurley's letter of resignation:

I will confine my remarks in this letter to Asia, although I wish to assure you that I will be at your service in discussing frankly other phases of our international relations. I was assigned to China at a time when statesmen were openly predicting the collapse of the National Government of the Republic of China and the disintegration of the Chinese Army. I was directed by President Roosevelt to prevent the collapse of the Government and to keep the Chinese Army in the war. From both a strategic and diplomatic viewpoint the foregoing constituted our chief objective. The next in importance was the directive to harmonize the relations between the Chinese and American Military Establishments and between the American Embassy in Chungking and the Chinese Government. It will readily appear that the former objective could not be accomplished without the accomplishment of the secondary objective as a condition precedent. Both of these objectives were accomplished. While these objectives had the support of the President and the Secretary of State, it is no secret that the American policy in China did not have the support of all the career men in the State Department. The professional Foreign Service men sided with the Chinese Communist-armed party and the imperialist bloc of nations whose policy it was to keep China divided against herself. Our professional diplomats continuously advised the Communists that my efforts in preventing the collapse of the National Government did not represent the policy of the United States. These same professional diplomats advised the Communist-armed party to decline unification of the Chinese Communist Army with the National Army unless the Chinese Communists were given control.

Despite these handicaps we did make progress toward unification of the armed forces of China. We did prevent civil war between the rival factions, at least until after I had left China. We did bring the leaders of the rival parties together for peaceful discussions. Throughout this period the chief opposition to the accomplishment of our mission came from the American career diplomats in the Embassy at Chungking and in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department.

I requested the relief of the career men who were opposing the American policy in the Chinese theater of war. These professional diplomats were returned to Washington and placed in the Chinese and Far Eastern Divisions of the State Department as my supervisors. Some of these same career men whom I relieved have been assigned as advisers to the supreme commander in Asia. In such positions most of them have continued to side with the Communist-armed party and at times with the imperialist bloc against American policy. This, Mr. President, is an outline of one of the reasons why American foreign policy announced by the highest authority is rendered ineffective by another section of diplomatic officials.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What has been done about it? For the period from the date he delivered his letter on November

26, 1945, to the publication of the white paper on August 5, 1949, the administration and not the Congress were in possession of this information.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should prefer not to yield until I have completed my remarks. Then I shall be glad to yield.

To be fair, I want to make clear that Mr. Butterworth did not arrive in China until the Hurley mission had been completed. He is obviously not one of those included in the Ambassador's indictment. But there were others. Where are they now? Are they still in our diplomatic service? Have they been promoted?

On pages 866 and 867 of his book, Roosevelt and Hopkins, Robert E. Sherwood has this to say about the February 1945 Yalta agreement as it related to China:

Roosevelt said * * * he would send an American officer to Chungking via Moscow to inform Chiang Kai-shek of the agreements. Stalin insisted that these agreements must be put in writing and must contain the statement: "The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated."

I continue quoting from Mr. Sherwood's book:

This, in my opinion, was the most assailable point in the entire Yalta record, and the most surprising in that it involved Roosevelt in the kind of firm commitment that usually he managed to avoid. It denied him the postwar "freedom of action" which he valued so highly; for, if China had refused to agree to any of the Soviet claims, presumably the United States and Britain would have been compelled to join in enforcing them.

I have tried to understand how and why we came to abandon China, our friend and ally, and for what purpose and at whose instigation.

While our policies in the prewar years of 1938, 1939, 1940, and 1941 up until December 7 left much to be desired, yet there seems to be no question that our general record was one of support of a free and independent China and sympathy for the problems she faced. In general we held firm to the Hay open-door policy which we have followed since 1899.

Shipments of scrap iron and oil to Japan with State Department consent was, of course, a contrary indication. However, just as there are those now who advocate the gains of doing business with Communist China, so there were governmental and business interests then who thought it wise to do business with Hitler or Tojo. That they were helping to build a war machine that could, in time, be used against us was apparently a calculated risk they were willing to take. It did not make sense to me then and it does not make sense to me now.

While the Yalta agreement of February 1945 violated the letter and spirit of the Cairo Declaration of December 1, 1943, the nine-power treaty of February 6, 1922, the Hay open-door policy which has been basic with us since 1899, and other statements, agreements, and policy decisions it does not, in itself, account

for the change of attitude in the executive branch of this Government.

To be sure it helped make possible a Communist stranglehold on Manchuria, opened the way for Russia to supply the Chinese Communists with captured Japanese arms, as well as with other assistance, and made certain that postwar China would not be united except as it might be by militant Communist forces or by more gradual means such as grew out of earlier or subsequent Polish-Czechoslovakian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, or Rumanian satellite experience.

But the Yalta agreement does not in itself account for other official attitudes taken by the executive branch of this Government which under our Constitution has primary responsibility for our foreign policy.

The time of basic change can be fixed as subsequent to the Wallace visit, June 21, 1944, and prior to the Marshall mission entering upon its duties in China, January 1946.

The circumstantial evidence is overwhelming that our fundamental shift in policy took place as a result of or in preparation for the Moscow conference of December 27, 1945, between Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Molotov, and Mr. Bevin, representing the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain.

The white paper gives strong evidence along these lines but the official State Department publication tells only part of the story.

On page 689 of the white paper (Annex 114) is a statement by President Truman on United States policy toward China issued on December 18, 1946. The opening paragraph reads:

Last December I made a statement of this Government's views regarding China. We believed then and do now that a United and Democratic China is of the utmost importance to world peace, that a broadening of the base of the national government to make it representative of the Chinese people will further China's progress toward this goal, and that China has a clear responsibility to the other United Nations to eliminate armed conflict within its territory as constituting a threat to world stability and peace. It was made clear at Moscow last year that these views are shared by our allies, Great Britain and the Soviet Union. On December 27, Mr. Byrnes, Mr. Molotov, and Mr. Bevin issued a statement which said, in part:

"The three foreign secretaries exchanged views with regard to the situation in China. They were in agreement as to the need for a unified and democratic China under the national government for broad participation by Democratic elements in all branches of the national government, and for a cessation of civil strife. They affirmed their adherence to the policy of noninterference in the internal affairs of China."

How often will the free world continue to be mouse-trapped by the Soviet brand of democracy. The so-called peoples democracies in the Soviet satellites are neither democracies nor selected by the people. They owe their being to police state methods under Communist Party discipline. Our Government has a heavy responsibility to millions of Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, and Chinese, living or dead, for helping to deliver them into the hands of peoples democracies.

So we have the clue to the events subsequent to December 1945. Was this far-reaching change originated by the foreign ministers at Moscow, or were they merely implementing a prior understanding arrived at in July of that year in Potsdam, or at some earlier time and place? This is not yet clear.

On page 71 of his book *Speaking Frankly*, former Secretary Byrnes, in discussing the Potsdam Conference, has this to say:

It is true that following Yalta we had been somewhat disillusioned. Such things as the Bern incident and the Soviet violation of agreements on Poland and Rumania warned us that in the days to come we would encounter serious differences and would have to overcome deep-seated suspicion.

On page 111 of the same book relative to the 1945 Moscow Conference, Byrnes has this to say:

The meeting opened at 5 p. m., December 16, and at my suggestion Mr. Molotov was made chairman. In recognition of Generalissimo Stalin's concern over the situation in the Far East, I had suggested including on the agenda proposals for the creation of a far eastern commission to function in Washington and an allied council to be located in Tokyo; a paper on the creation of a unified administration in Korea as a prelude to the establishment of an independent Korean Government; and a review of American policy in China, including the disarming of Japanese troops in north China. We agreed also that there would be informal discussions on the Soviet occupation of Manchuria.

In February 1947 the Department of State issued a publication entitled "Making the Peace Treaties: 1941-47." Appendix No. 3 on page 85 of the report by Secretary of State Byrnes on the December 16-26 Moscow meeting of Foreign ministers has this to say:

Our policy toward China as recently announced by President Truman was discussed at Moscow. We found our allies in substantial accord with that policy. The three governments agreed that the cessation of civil strife and broad participation throughout the national government of democratic elements are necessary to assure a unified, peaceful, and democratic China under the National Government. The three governments reaffirmed adherence to the policy of noninterference in the internal affairs of China. . . . The understanding of the three powers as to policy toward China should assist General Marshall in the mission he has undertaken.

Just how this understanding of noninterference with the internal affairs of China squares with the Marshall mission to force Communists into the government I am at loss to understand. The more confusing our policy becomes when I read from page 229 of Byrnes' book, *Speaking Frankly*, when he says—and I want Senators to listen closely to this paragraph:

General Marshall continued his efforts until January 1947, but the warring groups were still no nearer settlement. We then had to decide whether Ambassador Leighton Stuart should continue the efforts to bring the two factions together. John Carter Vincent, Chief of the Far Eastern Division and an experienced Foreign Service officer, took the position that he should not; that if General Marshall could not bring about unity, it would be unwise to ask any other official to force our views upon the factions. I agreed with Vincent.

I call particular attention to the words "force" and "factions." In other words, by the time of the Marshall mission we were treating the legally recognized Government of China as a faction and the revolutionary Communist forces were looked upon presumably as another faction on a parity with the legal Government of China itself.

We now know for the first time that the change must have taken place after November 10, 1945, which eliminates the July Potsdam Conference and the September London Foreign Ministers Conference. For certainly the President of the United States would not have sent a personal message to our wartime ally's President stating, without any reservation, that "he guarantees to continue to support you and the Nationalist Government," if this Nation had been foreclosed from such support by any prior international agreements.

Yet from mid-December on, this Government, despite that friendly message, follows a relentless policy of trying to force Communists into the Government of China.

Why? What is the nature of our agreement or the reasons for our policy that would require such a drastic shift? What individuals helped to formulate the policy, and by what were they motivated? The Senate is entitled to know. Our people should have the facts.

Such an agreement would explain the President's directive to General Marshall on December 15, 1945. It would explain the diligence with which General Marshall, good soldier that he is, carried out his difficult assignment. It would explain the pressures brought on Chiang Kai-shek, ranging from messages from President Truman, conferences by General Marshall, the embargo by this Government of military supplies to the government forces in China, while at the same time the Soviet Army was turning over captured Japanese supplies to the Chinese Communists, and threats to hold back any further economic aid. It would explain the deliberate slow-down on the military-aid program voted by the Congress in April of 1948 with the first ship arriving in November after the most crucial Manchurian battles had been lost by the government forces. It would explain the great reluctance to accept the amendment I offered to the arms implementation bill for the purpose of giving supervised aid to the non-Communist forces in China as we are to the non-Communist forces of the legal Government of Greece.

It would explain why a substantial slow-down has taken place in the ECA China administration of title 4 of the 1948 ECA Act. Over \$100,000,000 are being held back in the program for economic aid to non-Communist China. The funds will revert to the Treasury in February of next year if not expended. Fortunately, because of the action by Congress in amending the act this year, the balance must be spent in non-Communist China or not at all. This provision was written in despite the objection of the State Department. It explains why no word of encouragement or hope has gone out from the President or Secretary Acheson to our traditional

friends who are fighting with their backs to the wall in a Communist-inspired struggle that has been growing hotter while we waited for the dust to settle.

Yes, it also explains why little encouragement has been given by either Great Britain or the United States to the recent proposal that China lay her case before the United Nations. At an earlier date we discouraged such contemplated action. Do we fear that agreements made at Moscow or elsewhere will be produced that would embarrass this Government? Or is our solicitude for some wartime ally other than China?

It might even help to explain why the letter of June 24, 1949, to the President of the United States and signed by 21 Members of this body protesting any contemplated recognition of the Communists has never, so far as I know, been so much as acknowledged. The letter reads as follows:

JUNE 24, 1949.

HON. HARRY TRUMAN,

The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned Members of the Senate have been greatly concerned by reports that this Government might be contemplating the recognition of the Communist regime in China.

Any such policy would appear to be inconsistent with the position this Government took in Greece and Turkey when the Truman doctrine was enunciated and with the substantial support we have given through the Marshall plan to the nations of western Europe and with the North Atlantic Pact against aggression in western Europe.

Communist control of China means the ultimate negation of the open-door trade policy; loss of freedom and independence in a real sense for the people of China and a major victory for international communism with a corresponding threat to the national security of the United States.

We believe that the time has come for the adoption of an affirmative friendly policy toward the constitutional government of China and the forces opposing communism in that country.

We further believe that this Government should make it clear that no recognition of the Communist forces in China is presently contemplated and that we shall make clear that a free, independent, and non-Communist China will continue to have the friendship and assistance of the United States of America.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, PAT MCCARRAN, STYLES BRIDGES, WARREN MAGNUSON, OWEN BREWSTER, CLYDE REED, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, KARL MUNDT, HOMER FERGUSON, WAYNE MORSE, MILTON YOUNG, RAYMOND BALDWIN, EDWARD THYE, ROBERT A. TAFT, JOHN BRICKER, SPESARD HOLLAND, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, EDWARD MARTIN, HUGH BUTLER, GUY CORDON, HARRY CAIN.

What other proof do we now have that a basic change took place at or about the time of the December 16-26, 1945, Moscow Conference rather than at Potsdam in July, at the September 1945 Foreign Ministers meeting in London, or at some other meeting?

Recently there came into my hands a booklet published in Communist China entitled "Secret Report on the United States-Chiang Conspiracy" by one Ching Nu-Chi. I exhibit to the Senate a photostatic copy of the booklet. It is published by the New People's Publishing Co., Hong Kong, April 1949.

This document might properly be termed the Chinese equivalent of the Hiss-Chambers "pumpkin papers," which have baffled and greatly concerned the people of the United States.

The author turns out to be a Communist supporter. He secured a position as chief secretary of the Chinese Documents Secretariat. The office of which he was a part handled all types of secret and top-secret Chinese and American documents and did the necessary translations. He handled the same type of work for General Wedemeyer's headquarters and the Marshall mission to China.

From that source then comes the missing link which helps to fix the date of our fundamental change in policy. I have here with me photostats of the booklet in question. It is in Chinese. The translation was made for me, at my request, by an official United States Government agency, and at my suggestion translations of the complete booklet have been turned over to the State Department and the Department of National Defense.

Appendix 1 of this booklet contains the top-secret memorandum c-62-7 10 November 1945 from Wedemeyer to Chiang Kai-shek. This is the message General Wedemeyer was delivering to China. Wedemeyer, having recently gone to the United States for a conference with the President, with the Secretary of State, and with the General Staff, is coming back and is making his call upon the President of China, a friendly ally, and this is what he says:

Following is my report on the conclusions of the latest consultations with Washington: "Conference with the President. "C. He guarantees to continue to support you and the Nationalist Government."

Now here is a vital piece of information. For the first time there is disclosed to me, as a United States Senator, the fact that as late as November 10, 1945, after World War II had ended, the present President of the United States had sent a message to Chiang Kai-shek in which "he guarantees to continue to support you and the Nationalist Government." That is a pledge with no reservations.

It is a vital piece of information that should have been included in the China white paper if the American Congress and the country were to be dealt with frankly. Or was the white paper only meant to whitewash the State Department's record of tragic error?

We now have tied down for the first time the approximate date at which the fundamental and far-reaching change took place in our relations with China.

It is most unfortunate that the State Department saw fit to issue the white paper, which is largely meant to whitewash its own decisions and to undermine the legal Government of China at China's most desperate hour. It does not take much imagination to realize how General Washington and his men at Valley Forge would have felt if, during that bitter winter France, for example, had issued a white paper pointing out our faults and our lack of military successes.

Despite what the Executive branch of this Government has done, I, as a Mem-

ber of the United States Senate, am convinced that in the Congress of the United States and throughout the Nation there is a great reservoir of good will toward a China that should and will be free, independent of foreign domination of any kind, and non-Communist.

Let the administration speak up. Now is the time. Here is the place.

Are the non-Communist forces and the legal Government of China going to get some aid in the fight to keep the whole nation from being Communist-dominated?

If the Government of China brings the facts before the United Nations that Soviet Russia has been assisting a Communist revolutionary movement within China to overthrow the legal Government of China, a fellow member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council, will she have our assistance or our obstruction?

What is to be our position if on or about October 10 of this year the north China-Manchurian Communist regime proclaims itself a "people's democracy" and is recognized by the Soviet Union and her satellites as the de jure Government of China?

Have we an understanding with the British that for the present we will not extend de jure recognition but will recognize such a regime de facto for the area they control?

What are our intentions relative to trading with the Communist area? Does the prohibited list recently published mean that we will look with favor upon the trade of all other products and that we will no longer recognize the one outstanding success of the National Government of China, the effectiveness of the naval blockade? The effectiveness was amply testified to by Admiral Badger in his appearance before the committee.

Is the Senate of the United States to be kept fully informed or are we to have the unilateral democratic party policy in China and the Far East that has no relation to our bipartisan policy in Europe. Do we make two worlds out of American foreign policy, a free area of free men in Europe and the Middle East and an enslaved Asia with her billion human beings and her vast resources tied down tight to the Soviet orbit? But fairness requires that at the same time we recognize that Mr. Butterworth is in no sense the architect of the course we have followed. By the same token as he would have been entitled to share in part of the credit, he cannot escape part of the blame.

Must we always be limited to receiving information we need and should have after it is 4 years old, as in the case of the Hurley letter of resignation, or 2 years old, as in the case of the vital Wedemeyer report? Must we be limited to getting information from translations of Chinese Communist booklets published 8,000 miles away? This leaves too much to chance. It is not in such a way support can be built for a bipartisan continuing Far East foreign policy which is entitled to have the support of the American people.

As long as the present leadership exists in the formulation of far eastern policy I see no prospect of any substantial sup-

port from this side of the aisle, and it is not entitled to substantial support from the other side of the aisle.

Though my voice be the lone voice and my vote the lone vote I could not, in good conscience, place my approval on such a dismal record by voting confirmation of one who occupied a key spot in far-eastern affairs.

How many other reports are there such as the Wedemeyer report of September 17, 1947, which was concealed from the Congress and the people of the Nation until August 5, 1949, almost 2 years later, when it was published in the white paper. Yet the information contained therein would have been invaluable to members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees in making decisions.

How long is the Senate of the United States going to permit low and high echelon appointive officials to shape our policies and determine our Nation's destiny as well as people elsewhere while the Senate and the House, elected by the people, are treated at times as though they were not even parts of the same government?

Just as ignorance of the law is no excuse, so too it is no excuse for the Congress to tell the folks back home that they knew nothing about what was going on. It is our business to know. If Congress will use the power at its disposal it can keep itself fully informed. If we, as Members, abdicate our responsibility as a coequal branch of the Government then those who do so cannot disclaim their full share of the blame. Under our system responsibility must always be a corollary to power.

Though this administration may be satisfied with its bankrupt policy in China, the time will come—if it has indeed not already arrived—when the American people will not be. Even the apologists for the State Department admit that our China postwar policy has to date been a failure.

In any responsible government in the world those connected with such a state of affairs would resign or be forced out of office by parliament. Here, it seems, we promote them.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I desire to have printed as a part of the record a copy of a letter dated June 24, 1949, signed by 21 Members of the Senate, and addressed to the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 24, 1949.

HON. HARRY TRUMAN,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The undersigned Members of the Senate have been greatly concerned by reports that this Government might be contemplating the recognition of the Communist regime in China.

Any such policy would appear to be inconsistent with the position this Government took in Greece and Turkey when the Truman Doctrine was enunciated and with the substantial support we have given through the Marshall plan to the nations of western Europe and with the North Atlantic Pact against aggression in western Europe.

Communist control of China means the ultimate negation of the open-door trade policy; loss of freedom and independence in a real sense for the people of China and a major victory for international communism with a corresponding threat to the national security of the United States.

We believe that the time has come for the adoption of an affirmative, friendly policy toward the constitutional government of China and the forces opposing communism in that country.

We further believe that this Government should make it clear that no recognition of the Communist forces in China is presently contemplated and that we shall make clear that a free, independent, and non-Communist China will continue to have the friendship and assistance of the United States of America.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, PAT MCCARRAN, STYLES BRIDGES, WARREN MAGNUSON, OWEN BREWSTER, CLYDE REED, SHERIDAN DOWNNEY, KARL MUNDT, HOMER FERGUSON, WAYNE MORSE, MILTON YOUNG, RAYMOND BALDWIN, EDWARD THYE, ROBERT A. TAFT, JOHN BRICKER, SPESSARD HOLLAND, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, EDWARD MARTIN, HUGH BUTLER, GUY CORDON, HARRY CAIN.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter dated April 29, 1949, addressed to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and signed by a number of members of the Armed Services Committee who took the initiative in trying to get General Chennault to testify before the committee so that the Congress could at least partially inform itself.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 29, 1949.

Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the undersigned, members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services respectfully request that you as chairman extend an invitation to Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault, retired, to appear before the Committee on Armed Services on Monday, May 2, or at the earliest convenient date to him thereafter if Monday should not be convenient.

The purpose of hearing General Chennault would be to acquaint the members of the Armed Services Committee with the situation in China as it affects the national security of this country. It would also be our desire to learn from him whether or not military equipment furnished by the United States has been effectively used.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, CHAN GURNEY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, WAYNE MORSE, HARRY F. BYRD, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, STYLES BRIDGES, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, VIRGIL M. CHAPMAN, LESTER C. HUNT.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter signed by a number of Senators and addressed to Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, in which it was requested that both General MacArthur and Admiral Badger be brought before the committee so that we might be at least partially informed of conditions.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 9, 1949.

Hon. LOUIS JOHNSON,
Secretary of National Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the fact that our Chiefs of Staff have visited various European countries and are not likely to have the time to make the same sort of visit to the Far East, we strongly urge that our responsible commanders in the Far East, Gen. Douglas MacArthur and Vice Adm. Oscar C. Badger, be brought home for the purpose of giving testimony before the combined Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees on the far eastern phases of a problem which is global in character.

We urgently request that this be done immediately so that the benefit of their views may be had prior to final action of the combined committees on Senate bill 2388, "to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations."

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, STYLES BRIDGES, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, WAYNE MORSE, ALEXANDER WILEY, HARRY F. BYRD, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, CHAN GURNEY.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of a memorandum statement signed by Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and sent to the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, giving the viewpoint of that distinguished American on the critical situation in the Far East.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHINA-AID PROGRAM

I am grateful to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives for the confidence reflected in its desire that I appear before it to give my views on American policy in the extension of aid to China. The pressure of my operational duties in the administration of Japan, especially at this time of change in the Japanese Government, however, renders it impracticable for me to leave my post. And even were it otherwise, I gravely doubt that I could give constructive and helpful advice as to details involved in pending aid proposals, which I have not seen nor had any opportunity to study. China, as you perhaps know, is a theater of United States Navy control, outside the scope of my existing authority. I have no representatives there, and, apart from general background knowledge, such detailed information as has been available to me has been derived largely by indirection. Exhaustive investigations of the Chinese situation have been made by responsible United States officials, but these studies are not within my channel of information or command and in consequence I am not adequately familiar therewith. I have furthermore not had the opportunity to visit China for many years. With this background, you will readily perceive I am not in a position to render authoritative advice with reference to the myriad of details on which a definitive policy for this particular area must necessarily rest.

In general answer to your specific questions, I can say without the slightest hesitation that a free, independent, peaceful, and friendly China is of profound importance to the peace of the world and to the position of the United States. It is the fundamental keystone to the Pacific arch. Underlying all issues in China is now the military

problem. Until it is resolved little progress can be expected toward internal rehabilitation regardless of the extent of outside aid. Once it is resolved, however, there is little doubt but that China's traditional resiliency will provide the basis for rapid recovery to relative stability.

The Chinese problem is part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety in the orientation of American policy. Fragmentary decisions in disconnected sectors of the world will not bring an integrated solution. The problem insofar as the United States is concerned is an over-all one and can only be resolved on the broadest possible global basis. It would be utterly fallacious to underrate either China's needs or her importance. For if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major frontier is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all. Because of deep-rooted racial and cultural and business ties, we are prone to overconcentrate on happenings and events to our east and to underemphasize the importance of those to our west. America's past lies deeply rooted in the areas across the Atlantic but the hope of American generations of the future to keep pace with the progress of those of the past lies no less in the happenings and events across the Pacific. While fully availing ourselves of the potential to the east, to our western horizon we must look both for hope of a better life through yet untapped opportunities for trade and commerce in the advance of Asiatic races, and threat against the life with which we are even now endowed. For beyond that horizon, upon the outcome of the ideological struggles in which opposing forces are now engaged and the restoration of political, economic, and social stability, rests war or peace, assurance or threat, hope or fear.

The international aspect of the Chinese problem unfortunately has become somewhat clouded by demands for internal reform. Desirable as such reform may be, its importance is but secondary to the issue of civil strife now engulfing the land, and the two issues are as impossible of synchronization as it would be to alter the structural design of a house while the same was being consumed by flame. Friendly and searching as our interest may be in the reformation of China's institutions and practices to bring them closer into line with our own concept of liberty and justice, and right and wrong, the maintenance of China's integrity against destructive forces which threaten her engulfment is of infinitely more immediate concern. For with the firm maintenance of such integrity, reform will gradually take place in the evolutionary processes of China's future.

The flow to China of military supplies, surplus to our own requirements, has been resumed. Additional material support should be measured in equitable relation to such global aid as may be determined upon in the orientation of American policy, without underrating the strategic importance to us, as to the world, of a free and peaceful China, without ignoring her impoverishment and fatigue in consequence of so many years of violent struggle over her soil, without failing accurately to assess her potential in the stability and advancement of our own future standard of life, and without neglecting to recognize our long and friendly relationship, well-tested through years of peace and years of war.

In the determination of our global policy, care must, of course, be exercised to avoid commitment of our resources beyond what we can safely spare—the sapping of our national strength to the point of jeopardy to our own security and the overburdening of our people beyond their capacity to maintain a standard of life consistent with the energies with which they are naturally en-

dowed. For it would be illogical for us to yield our own liberties in the safeguard of the liberties of others—to forfeit our own heritage of freedom in securing the freedom of others. No less illogical would it be to extend our material aid beyond hope of reciprocal repayment through contribution in one form or another to human progress. For it would not serve our purpose merely to create in return for our sacrifice a condition of indigence and mendicancy elsewhere, to become a brake upon human advancement.

It is one of the traditional characteristics of the American people that in times of great crises they have never failed to rise to masterful heights to meet the challenge of the time. Never before has our wise, fearless, and positive leadership of a confused world been more needed as a stabilizing influence. Never before have the American people been more ready to assist others if it be a purposeful sacrifice. For we on American soil bare before the eyes of the entire world the workings of a way of life which despite the veil of confusion and disorder and self-serving ambition is the cherished hope and goal of all mankind. Let us above all else preserve it.

MACARTHUR.

(NOTE.—The above message dispatched to the Hon. CHARLES A. EATON, chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, by radio ZX-40728, dated March 3, 1948, in response to a radio received from him inviting General MacArthur to appear before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to give his views on what American policy should be with respect to proposals of aid to China and other critical areas in the Far East. He also requested that if it were impracticable for the general to appear in person, that he send a statement presenting his views. The radio was released to the press in the United States on March 4, 1948.)

Mr. KNOWLAND. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a very interesting item which includes both a letter and a memorandum. I wish to read a part of it to the Senate at this time. It was issued on the letterhead of the Communist Party of New York State, and is dated New York, N. Y., March 1, 1949. It is addressed "To all sections and counties."

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed please find program for action on China policy, as voted upon by a United Front Action Conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

We are sure that you will find this material not only informative but helpful in planning actions on China in your communities.

A special outline has also been issued by the National Education Committee on Communist Policy in China. This can be secured through orders from our district education department. The outline can be used as the basis for discussion in your sections and branches.

Any inquiries in relation to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, at 111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

The letter is signed by May Miller, assistant organizing secretary.

Immediately following the letter there is listed a Program for Action on China Policy as suggested by the Action Conference on China Policy, New York City, January 29, 1949. Listen to this:

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Demand a congressional investigation.
A. Of the Chinese lobby in Washington, one of the largest spending foreign influences in our Capital not registered as foreign agents.

B. Of the billions of dollars of private accumulation deposited in American banks and investments by Chinese officials and individuals.

2. Demand a new China policy.

A. An end to all forms of American intervention in China and of plans to aid any elements and remnants of the Kuomintang.

B. Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now establishing.

C. Planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with the people's government in China, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

3. Get the facts and implications of the Government's China policy to the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter and memorandum be printed in their entirety at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNIST PARTY OF NEW YORK STATE,
New York, N. Y., March 1, 1949.

To All Sections and Counties:

DEAR COMRADES: Enclosed please find program for action on China policy, as voted upon by a united front action conference on China, held in New York on January 29, 1949.

We are sure that you will find this material not only informative but helpful in planning actions on China in your communities.

A special outline has also been issued by the national education committee on Communist policy in China. This can be secured through orders from our district education department. The outline can be used as the basis for discussion in your sections and branches.

Any inquiries in relation to further activity can be received by writing to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, at 111 West Forty-second Street, New York City.

Comradely yours,

MAY MILLER,
Assistant Organizing Secretary.

PROGRAM FOR ACTION ON CHINA POLICY AS
SUGGESTED BY THE ACTION CONFERENCE ON
CHINA POLICY, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY
29, 1949

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Demand a congressional investigation.
A. Of the Chinese lobby in Washington. One of the largest spending foreign influences in our Capital; not registered as foreign agents.

B. Of the billions of dollars of private accumulation deposited in American banks and investments by Chinese officials and individuals.

2. Demand a new China policy.

A. An end to all forms of American intervention in China and of plans to aid any elements and remnants of the Kuomintang.

B. Preparation by our Government to recognize the government which the people of China are now establishing.

C. Planning now by our authorities for genuine and self-respecting cooperation with the people's government in China, including normal and friendly trade relations free of any political conditions.

3. Get the facts and implications of the Government's China policy to the American people.

IMMEDIATE STEPS FOR CARRYING OUT THE ACTION PROGRAM

1. Get your organization immediately to pass a resolution on China policy (use the enclosed January conference resolution for suggestions). Send copies of your organiza-

tion's resolution to your Senators and your Congressmen; give it publicity in your organization's publication and elsewhere; send a copy to the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

2. Make use of the "political ammunition" of facts; the American people, if they know, will act.

A. Make a drive to get readers and subscribers to Far East Spotlight, the committee's monthly magazine. This is the indispensable tool for every fighter for a new and friendly policy toward China. Previous sources of reliable information about China and the Far East now have an NAM slant; only Far East Spotlight gives you the positive and encouraging facts about the Chinese people's great and successful fight against American reaction, and keeps you up to date about Washington's evil plans to go on backing reaction in China and the Far East. Subscription: \$2 a year. Introductory offer: \$1 for 8 months. Members of the CDFEP get this free.

B. Push the sale and reading of Anna Louise Strong's Tomorrow's China. Paper bound, 65 cents; cloth bound, \$2. Organizational orders for five or more: 25-percent discount.

C. Have meetings on the China policy issue.

(a) The committee can furnish speakers:

In the New York City area: Telephone the speaker's bureau of the committee any afternoon, Bryant 9-6343.

In California, the San Francisco area: Contact Mr. William Kerner, 1841 Ellis Street, San Francisco.

Los Angeles area: Contact Mrs. Jeanette Orel, 362 South Columbia Avenue, Los Angeles.

(b) Send your organization's own speakers to the briefing session on China. First session: Friday night, February 18, 7:30 sharp. Telephone the committee for registration blanks; Bryant 9-6342. No fee.

You can't fight without facts. Far East Spotlight is your basic source of information. Meetings on China will bring facts to hundreds of others.

3. See to it that the President and the Members of Congress hear from hundreds of individuals on China policy right now.

Order prepared postcards from the committee—1 cent each. Write your own messages. Make calls—in person and by telephone—on your Senators and Congressmen.

4. Have your organization make an immediate contribution to the work of the committee or plan to give a regular (monthly, quarterly, or yearly) contribution.

5. Support the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy.

A. By becoming members and by getting your friends to join. Membership includes subscriptions to Far East Spotlight.

B. By securing individual contributions for the committee. Your own; your friends; throw a party for the committee.

C. By doing volunteer work at the committee's office, 111 West Forty-second Street, fifth floor—any time, any day.

Every Thursday night the staff is at home to friends who come to help.

The Chinese people are defeating the American reactionaries. So can we.

China policy reveals the over-all character of Washington's foreign policy—it harms the American people.

China policy is directly related to our domestic struggle for homes, for more consumption goods, for lower prices, for increased social security, for healthy international trade, for freedom from depression and militarism.

China shows up the weak spot in our reactionaries' program.

Let's fight on China policy and take advantage of the blow the Chinese people have dealt the American reactionaries.

COMMITTEE FOR A DEMOCRATIC
FAR EASTERN POLICY.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a memorandum which purports to be from Wedemeyer to Chiang Kai-shek. It is headed "Top Secret Memorandum C-62-7, 10 November 1945." It was published for the first time, so far as I know, in the document to which I have referred, which was published in Hong Kong. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEDEMEYER TO CHIANG KAI-SHEK

Your Excellency: 1. Following is my report on the conclusions of the latest consultations with Washington.

2. Conference with the President:

(a) He requested me to inquire after your health.

(b) He states his satisfaction with developments in the present war situation.

(c) He guarantees to continue to support you and the Nationalist Government.

(d) He emphasized that American naval and air personnel in China must be withdrawn at an early date, for in America great pressure is being concentrated on the withdrawal of American (military) personnel from China.

3. Conference with Secretary of State:

(a) He repeated the President's words, promising support to you and the Nationalist Government. But he also declared the President's instructions that the United States positively should not participate in China's military clashes; nor could any facilities be given for the Central Government's actions against rebellious military elements within Chinese territory.

4. Conference with the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

(a) They indicated complete agreement with the President's China policy.

(b) Approved the organization of a military advisory group for China. (See below section 8, for further details.)

(c) Also approved further military aid to China. (See the discussion in section 10 below.)

(d) Stated with emphasis that American troops could not participate in the Chinese civil war. In its relations with the United States, England, France, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and other foreign nations, the Chinese Government should maintain an unbiased position. They declared plainly, American military aid to China will cease immediately if evidence compels the United States Government to believe that any Chinese troops receiving such aid are using it to support any government which the United States cannot accept, to conduct civil war, or for aggressive or coercive purposes.

The degree to which China has attained political stability and security under a unified government completely representative of the people will be regarded as the fundamental condition governing the United States economic, military, and other forms of assistance.

The United States Government will from time to time consider the degree to which China has met the aforesaid fundamental condition as the standard according to which to decide whether or not to continue its aid.

(e) It was emphasized that China must strive to reduce its military forces to 50 divisions, and to see that air transport equipment is provided to facilitate their movements.

5. The occupation of Manchuria:

(a) I have been given authority to assist China to carry out the occupation of Manchuria, but not to send Americans to take part in it. The United States Government considers that the occupation of Manchuria

should be a matter for consultation between the Chinese and U. S. S. R. Governments.

(b) I consider the occupation of Manchuria a matter of highest importance. But in the movement of Central Government troops, we should make use of internal lines of transportation, and these internal lines of transportation must be entirely safe. For instance, all territory south of the Ch'ang Chiang (Yangtzu River) is already under Central Government control.

Areas north of the Ch'ang Chiang, including Pei-p'ing, T'ien-ching, Ch'in-huang-tao, T'ang-ku, and Ch'ang-chia-k'ou (Kalgan), are still not all under Central Government control. I consider it necessary that all lines of communication in these areas must be controlled by the Central Government before troops can be dispatched northward into Manchuria, and westward into Sinkiang and Suiyuan.

(c) It is suggested that it is not necessary to send troops to Korea and Japan. I have been instructed to inform General MacArthur to this effect. Thus the Central Government will have more troops available with which to stabilize the Chinese situation. I acknowledge that it would add to China's prestige and be in accord with desires of the Chinese people if a token force were sent to occupy Korea and Japan; but the developments of the situation in China are such that Chinese troops can be used only in China proper, in Taiwan, and last of all in Manchuria. It is possible that at some later time, China may properly send a token force to Korea and Japan.

(d) Concerning northern Annam, it is suggested that the Chinese Government consult with the French Government and the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, so that the French troops may enter Haiphong and Hanoi.

(e) Troops dispatched to areas north of the Ch'ang Chiang should be supplied with winter clothing and equipment.

(f) Troops sent northward from the Ch'ang Chiang for the protection of the Pei-p'ing-Han-k'ou Railway and the T'ien-ching-P'u-k'ou Railway should be closely followed by police and garrison troops. These latter police and garrison troops should be equipped for preserving the safety of the railway lines, for precautions against destructive attempts, and at all times prepared to repair bridges after the fashion of the German General Todt's organization. Thus, the combat troops need not be retained to guard the railways, and police and garrison troops who are less efficient for combat can assume the responsibility for guarding the railway.

6. Repatriation of Japanese:

(a) According to what I learned in Washington, it is not the intention for the United States to leave American troops indefinitely in China for the purpose of disarming and repatriating the Japanese troops. The American policy is to assist the Chinese Government in planning the repatriation of the Japanese troops and to make use of American sea and air facilities in assisting the disposition of the Central Government troops, to such extent as would not hinder the demobilization of American troops wherever they might be. In accord with this policy, I was able to undertake the air transport of Central Government troops (this work is already finished), and water transportation of Central Government troops (this work is now in progress). But since the American Air Force has been in progress of rapid demobilization, our assistance in the air transport of Central Government troops has been limited, and water transportation likewise. However, I will exhaust every possibility to give air transport equipment, landing craft, and other smaller boats to China for its use so that it may continue the distribution of its troops. In September of last year (1944) in Chungking when the plan for the distribution of the Central Government troops was decided upon in the Chinese-American

Joint Staff Conference, we did not anticipate the obstacles that would be encountered (in the course of distribution of troops). Furthermore, we did not foresee the difficulties the Chinese Communists or the Soviet (troops) were to create. The plans adopted were correct at that time; but in view of the present circumstances, the number of troops to be sent to the areas captured and held by the Japanese must be increased.

(b) In order that I may satisfactorily assist and advise you, it is essential that I be thoroughly familiar with the terms of the convention arranged between China and the Soviet Union. I request that a copy of this convention be supplied to me so that I may study it and be able to apprehend its implications; and for the same reason, I request a copy of the agreement entered into between yourself and the Chinese Communists.

As the commanding officer of the American troops (in China), I cannot allow myself or the troops under me to become involved in the vortex of difficulties between the Central Government (on the one hand) and the Chinese Communists, USSR elements and other rebellious elements in the northeast (on the other hand). The instructions I have received from Washington are based on the assumption that the solution of the problems between the Central Government and the Chinese Communists and the Soviet (government) is solely the responsibility of the Chinese Government itself. But as your Chief of Staff, I am very desirous to study the implications of all phases of the problem in order that my views may contribute to the solution of the problems which confront us.

(c) I am informed that there are some 70,000 armed Japanese troops in the Pei-p'ing region. These troops are moving rapidly from place to place in large motor trucks. If these trucks were turned over to the Chinese army, of course they would be of immense usefulness. I have told General Lodge (?) and General Li (or Lee?) that these Japanese soldiers should be disarmed as soon as possible and their motor trucks given to the Chinese army. I believe that if we allow the Japanese soldiers to retain their arms for several months longer (it is already 3 months since the Japanese surrender), we shall see (the development of) an unprecedentedly serious problem. I am strenuously opposed to the use of Japanese troops to resist the Chinese Communists. I believe such a course would be damaging to your reputation both in China and abroad.

(d) It is my recommendation that the repatriation of military and nonmilitary Japanese in regions north of the Ch'ang Chiang should be regarded as the most important thing to be done. By so doing, the responsibility of the Chinese army for dealing with the Japanese may be reduced to a minimum, and then the Chinese troops may be used in plans for safeguarding China's political security. A further consideration is that a severe winter is approaching bringing anxiety concerning food. This will be a serious problem for tens of thousands of Japanese soldiers, and will create difficulties not easy to cope with.

(e) Within this war zone there are many Japanese war criminals. My recommendation is for you to immediately notify the officials in each war zone to arrest all Japanese war criminals who have committed criminal acts against Chinese, Americans, or the people of any other allied country.

(f) The Minister of War has addressed to me a memorandum directing me to order General Lodge (?) to hand over to the Chinese (military authorities) all the Japanese winter equipment, clothing, etc., now stored in T'ien-ching. This I have already instructed General Lodge (?) to do. We should prepare for our records a detailed inventory of these goods with acknowledgment of receipt of same.

WEDEMEYER,
Chief of Staff of the China War Zone.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, before moving that the Senate take a recess as in executive session, it occurs to me that we might take up the nominations in the Public Health Service to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will state the nominations in the Public Health Service.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations.

RECESS

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 26 (legislative day of September 3), 1949:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Lowell B. Mason, of Illinois, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1949. (Reappointment.)

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Harold B. Sallada, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned in the United States Coast Guard:

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Jason S. Kebler
David R. Permar

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 26 (legislative day of September 3), 1949:

UNITED NATIONS

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Warren R. Austin
Philip C. Jessup
Mrs. Anna Eleanor Roosevelt
John Sherman Cooper

ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FOURTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Wilson M. Compton
Benjamin V. Cohen
Charles Fahy
John D. Hickerson
Mrs. Ruth B. Rohde

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)
Robert L. Stenburg

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain)

Mary J. Yardley Katherine L. Broyles
Mary E. Allen Ruth I. Webb
Elizabeth J. Haglund

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We have heard Thy voice, our Father, and again we come to Thee; let Thy goodness and justice possess us.

O God, we pray today that rivalry among the nations may cease, and veiled pretensions may no longer disturb humanity, and man to man shall brother be. O forever stifle the wicked ambitions of men, that they may live in concord in the clear sunshine of Thy righteousness and mercy.

Grant Thy presence upon the Congress this day, that this august body may be known as constructive servants, exalting our country and making it altogether worthy of praise. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, September 22, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 930. An act to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes;

S. 1453. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes; and

S. 2116. An act to provide for the advance planning of non-Federal public works.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5895. An act to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 1746) entitled "An act to pro-

vide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2944) entitled "An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide survivorship benefits for widows or widowers of persons retiring under such act."

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVENPORT asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes following disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject United States Obligation to the Polish Nation, and include a resolution by the M. R. Falcons Nest, No. 4, of the Polish Falcons of America at South Bend, Ind.

THE LATE HONORABLE RICHARD J. WELCH

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, although I was present when the House of Representatives adjourned on September 13 in respect to the memory of Representative RICHARD J. WELCH, whose death had occurred on September 10, the special rules adopted for the 3-day recess schedule then in effect made it impossible for me to address the House or extend my remarks in the RECORD. I therefore ask recognition at this time to pay a tribute to my late colleague and dear friend, whose sudden death has shocked all who knew him.

It was my privilege to be closely associated in Congress for nearly 10 years with DICK WELCH. The district which he represented so ably for more than two decades adjoins my own congressional district in the city of San Francisco. Before his election to Congress 23 years ago, he and I served together as members of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco. So our association has been a long and close one, and I shall always treasure it as one of the finest experiences of my life. DICK WELCH honored me with his friendship and his confidence, and we consulted together on every problem of importance to our neighboring constituencies during all of our joint service in this House.

DICK WELCH had the rare quality of sound judgment, which made his advice invaluable to me, and enabled him to render outstanding service to the people who had elected him as their Representative in Congress for nearly a quarter of a century.

Mr. Speaker, a splendid story about the life work of RICHARD WELCH has been

written by Miss Ruth Finney, Scripps-Howard correspondent for the San Francisco News. Unquestionably she followed his career in Congress more closely than any other person, except the members of his family, and her understanding and appreciative biography of this good public servant whom she knew so well is one of the finest tributes that any man could have.

The article referred to follows:

For a long time, Representative RICHARD J. WELCH had been carrying a powerful heart stimulant in his pocket as he went about his duties in the House of Representatives. He hadn't talked about it any more than he had talked about the fact of his advancing years. He had been born February 13, 1869. And he had had several operations in recent years, one of them serious.

But he was a fighting Congressman, and the older he grew, the harder he fought.

Many of his colleagues, reaching that age, were very old men, falling in mind and spirit, too tired to care much what went on.

That was not true of Congressman WELCH. His seniority and his experience were tools which he wielded skillfully in behalf of causes in which he believed, and the city which he loved.

Most men grow conservative as they grow older, lose patience with experiments, abandon their earlier fighting faiths. Again, that was not true of DICK WELCH. Some years ago he had thought seriously of retiring from the House, because he loved San Francisco so much, and hated to be away from it most of the year.

STAYED ON TO FIGHT

But he was too much interested in what became of Central Valley project, in whether public power would help pay out the irrigation costs; in whether San Francisco would get a new bay crossing with a chance to survive enemy attack or natural disaster. So he stayed on to fight for those things. No one else could have done the job so well, because he had the prestige in the House that comes only with long service and the friendships which open all the doors.

Mr. WELCH was born in New York State, but came to California when he was 16. He lived on a farm near Freeport, and never forgot what it was like to get a living from the soil.

In San Francisco, he learned to be an iron molder at the old Union Iron Works, and before he left that business, he was a full-fledged machinist. There was a strike and he went out with the others. He never forgot what it was like to be a workman, either.

ENTERED POLITICS

The next step took him into politics as deputy county clerk here, and in November 1900, he was elected to the State senate. In 1903 he became chief wharfinger for the harbor of San Francisco, a post he held for 4 years. He was wharfinger in 1906, through the earthquake and fire, and, in his official capacity, saw more of the terror and of what was done to meet it than most San Franciscans. The horrors of 1906 were at the root of his tenacious fight for a southern bay crossing—another way to get out of San Francisco if disaster should strike again.

In the State senate, Mr. WELCH was author of the constitutional amendment for workmen's compensation, and of that for inspection of weights and measures. He sponsored laws to provide an 8-hour day for women, pensions for widows and orphans, safety measures on construction projects.

Some years after his senate career, he ran for supervisor in San Francisco, and was elected. That was when he began thinking about a bridge across the Golden Gate, and when he organized the first steps for

a skyline drive down the peninsula, and Bayshore Boulevard.

ELECTED TO CONGRESS

On August 31, 1926, he was elected to the House of Representatives to succeed Lawrence J. Flaherty, who had died in office. Like Mr. Flaherty, and John I. Nolan who had preceded him, Mr. WELCH asked for and got membership on the House Labor Committee. The first measure he sponsored in Congress raised the rates of pay for Federal workers, with emphasis on the charwomen and others in the lower-salary grades.

He stayed on the Labor Committee until he had climbed the legislative seniority ladder, and all the way through the Roosevelt administration he was ranking minority Member and heartily in favor of all the New Deal labor bills that came along.

In all his service, he never failed to cast a vote for measures that were intended to help workers.

DEMOCRATS ASKED HIS HELP

His stalwart championship of the laboring man's cause drew him into an unusual situation only a few months ago in the midst of Taft-Hartley law battles in the House. Administration leaders turned to Congressman WELCH, the Republican from San Francisco, for a rescue move when their own party couldn't help.

It was Congressman WELCH, at the special urging of Democratic leaders who rose to make the dramatic motion to recommit the Taft-Hartley Act to committee, the only move at that time that could spike a drive towards enactment of another labor law virtually equivalent to the Taft-Hartley. His move carried.

He could have been chairman of the House Labor Committee when the Republicans took over in the Eightieth Congress. He had the seniority for it, and he also had seniority to make him chairman of Merchant Marine and Fisheries, or of the House Public Lands Committee.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT FOE

He chose the last of these three. He had no stomach for Republican plans for rewriting the Wagner National Labor Relations Act into what later became Taft-Hartley, and he wouldn't have been able to stop them, even as chairman of the committee. He had fought long and hard for shipbuilding on the Pacific coast and for prewar benefits to intercoastal and coastwise shipping. He was years ahead of President Truman in asking for Government steel plants. He wanted them built on the Pacific coast to help the shipbuilding industry there.

But when it came to choosing, DICK WELCH picked the Public Lands Committee because he thought it was most important, just then, to his city and his whole West.

He took on a fight, which lasted as long as he lived, to safeguard the West's resources from destruction and abuse, to conserve its scarce water supply, to develop its power, and to use that power in a way that would help make irrigation water cheap enough for the farmers who needed it so desperately in the valley.

LOVER OF FORESTS

When he talked about saving the West's great forests, he spoke of them with love: "I've seen the best of this country. I was just one generation behind the pioneers. I was able to see the West when it was beautifully wild, when you could go out and pitch a tent, and ride and fish, and there weren't a million automobiles all over everything. I never saw anything as beautiful in Europe."

And another time, about the redwoods:

"They were there when Moses was a baby in the bulrushes and when the Saviour was carrying His cross up Calvary Hill. But these historical facts have no appeal to those who are permitted to slash, slaughter, and destroy the remaining forests in this country."

He was speaking near the close of the Eightieth Congress, in what was to be his last utterance as chairman of Public Lands, and he made it a general plea for selective removal of trees and for reforestation; for more and more development of hydroelectric power to save the country's fast-vanishing oil supplies.

BLOCKED LUMBER INTERESTS

That was not the mood of the Eightieth, and they paid little attention to what the San Francisco Congressman was saying—a fact of which he reminded fellow Republicans after the West's 1948 swing into the Democratic column.

But because he was chairman of Public Lands in the Eightieth, he succeeded in stopping a great variety of measures that at the start of the Congress had seemed likely to pass. He blocked efforts to turn great groves of trees in Olympic National Park over to lumber interests for cutting.

He fought, every inch of the way, for 2 years, against an attempt to rewrite reclamation law in a way that would prevent use of the power interest component to help pay off irrigation water costs in the Central Valley and on other projects. No legislation to repeal the 160-acre clause had a chance in his committee. Nor any bills to give away grazing lands to the States or to private individuals. He fought every measure that proposed higher rates for power generated at public projects and every proposal for selling public power at the busbar.

He sponsored resolutions to explore great adventurous new projects for saving water in the West—a project to divert surplus waters of the Columbia as far south as Los Angeles; a project to dam the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers above Mare Island and create a great fresh-water lake there; a project to divert surplus waters everywhere west of the ninety-eighth meridian to the arid lands of Texas, Oklahoma, and other Southwestern States.

LEADER IN CVP FIGHT

After turning over the Public Lands Committee to a Democratic chairman, Representative Welch was just as interested—and worked just as hard—for public power at Folsom Dam, for keeping power costs and irrigation water costs down. He helped organize the floor fight in the House that saved Central Valley's transmission line and steam plant when they were under attack by fellow Republicans.

San Francisco's bridges were very dear to DICK WELCH's heart. He was proud of the major part he had played in getting congressional approval for the Golden Gate Bridge, and as long as he lived he was a director of the bridge authority. He played a large part also in getting the Bay Bridge authorized and built. And he began well before World War II to work for the construction of a third crossing—this time a southern crossing to serve a different section of the bay region and to further safeguard its people in event of catastrophe. He had hoped to live long enough to see it built.

Only 21 Members of the House had served longer in Congress than DICK WELCH and only 9 of those were Republicans. He was the only man from the West to be honored with such long-continued endorsement from the voters of both parties. He was aware of this and grateful for it, and he never abused the trust.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Kansas City Times.

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an editorial.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Herald.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday I secured permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed 2 pages of the RECORD and will cost \$287, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he recently delivered on the United States Constitution at Salem, Ill.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; one relating to the security of the United States, and the other an address delivered by former Representative Everett M. Dirksen at Peoria, Ill., September 18, at the time he announced his candidacy for the Republican nomination for United States Senator.

GABRIELSON, BLOW YOUR HORN

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the once great Republican Party of the people is in the control now of plunderbunders and the slumberbunders.

The first group is as ferociously active as virus X in an effort to pollute and prostrate the body politic and is just as deadly too, but fortunately not as catching.

The second group are those who are fully cognizant of what is going on, as they hover around the table of modern Dives, not Lazaruslike endeavoring to subsist upon the crumbs which fall from the table, but bad-boy like, snatching the choice morsels from the never-ceasing economic banquet board, and are thus enabled to walk about during their leisure, not like gangling skeletons, but like fat capons with bellies well-rounded. They have the disgusting habit also of falling asleep when the rights of the people are being considered.

The truly American minority of the Republican Party seems to be powerless to do anything to dispossess the plunderbunders and the slumberbunders from their present control in order to preserve the contemplated and desirable two-party system of our Republic, and I guess that they have no choice but to leave their present bad and odious com-

pany and join the Democratic Party for a proper way of life.

From the State of Iowa comes the whopping news that the plunderbunders and the slumberbunders have now announced that they intend to carry on a rip-snorting, fighting campaign to regain possession and control of the Congress of the United States.

I now suggest a proper marching tune for them, suggested by an old Negro spiritual, "Gabrielson blow your horn, blow, blow, blow that horn." However do not be credulous as to think that the walls of modern Jericho will again fall down when Gabrielson blows his horn but on the contrary Gabrielson and the whole Republican Party will fall down again and go tumbling into the political discard, perhaps for keeps.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on tomorrow at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Administration has issued some very arbitrary and bungling regulations regarding the training of GI's in schools and colleges. As a result some of them will not get their compensation perhaps even until January. They will have another month in order to file their applications if they want to change from one college to another, but as a result of the mistake some of them will not get their compensation checks for their training for some time. I am very much disturbed by the delays in payments by the Veterans' Administration. The veterans need the money immediately when it is due. They are unable to wait several months with the uncertainty of not receiving it. I have asked General Gray to take whatever action is necessary in order to correct the situation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

BACTERIOLOGICAL WARFARE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, humanity has always been afraid of the unknown. We have been afraid of the atomic bomb and the damage it might do. With the announcement that Russia has exploded an atomic bomb, this secret is no longer the monopoly of our country. It may help clear the atmosphere. It was not unexpected. Scientific knowledge is universal knowledge. The thinking of some liberals in this country undoubtedly hastened the day that Russia would have the secrets of the bomb. It is common knowledge that we ship thousands of pounds of uranium ore to Russia, and from the investigations into the spy ring in Canada, we know that quantities of purified uranium were flown to Moscow.

It seems likely that the arms race will be renewed, with each country trying to develop more deadly and scientific means for destruction. I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that with the full development of the atomic bomb, it will soon fall into the same classification as that of poison gas. Neither side used poison gas in the last war, and the reason is well known. It does seem that large standing armies and navies, and similar types of warfare, may well be made obsolete through the development of other means of destruction.

Mr. Speaker, now that the secrets of the atomic bomb are known, we must give some attention to the deadly destruction which can be caused by bacteriological and virus warfare. It is a known fact that the technique of germ warfare has developed to a place in which it could be used to effectively destroy large masses of people. Wars, in the future, unlike those of the past, will not be directed against just the military, but against the entire population. Our country is particularly vulnerable with the use of bacteria and virus in attacks upon the masses. I am thinking now of the ease with which agents, who are known enemies of our country, could plant the live virus and its media, in the open water supplies upon which half of the cities of the United States must depend. We allow these enemies of our way of life to move freely about the country. How easy it would be to contaminate these waters. The present use of chlorine and other similar methods to kill bacteria would be ineffective against these virulent germs.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that around Peekskill, N. Y., there are several Communist camps. It is a known fact that the cities below this area depend upon the surface waters from this area for their water supply. If Russia is the one we fear, and a war should come, how easy it would be for these subversive agents to kill and demoralize the population of large areas.

It seems to me that the Congress should take definite steps for protection against bacteriological warfare. Laws should be enacted to take care of and put into custody these known subversive individuals. A careful check should be made of water supplies and open reservoirs upon which cities depend for their water. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have been lax and apathetic about this approach to our defense.

The only hope that I can see is that of definitely outlawing through the United Nations, the use, not only of poison gas and the atomic bomb, but virus warfare. Perhaps the awfulness of the next war will force those who represent the world at the United Nations to take definite steps in outlawing the use of these death-dealing weapons. In the meantime, we should be on our guard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the Panama Canal.

ARMS AID TO ATLANTIC PACT NATIONS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the President in a very timely statement has said that the atomic bomb is now available to Russia. He knew when to say that, because now all the radios and newspapers are talking about the atomic bomb and what it is liable to do. Why did the President make that statement at this time? Because he wanted us to give \$1,400,000,000 to arm all the countries signatory to the Atlantic Pact, one of the most ridiculous and asinine things a nation could do. We talk war and get ready for war and we all want peace.

What would happen if Russia came over here and armed Cuba? What would happen if Russia came over here and armed Mexico? It would be like sticking a dagger right into the heart of our Nation. We would be suspicious and skeptical of her motives.

I think it is the most untimely thing that could happen to the American people. I ask that the House of Representatives not yield on the question of increasing the authorization for these arms. We should not give them a nickel to arm any foreign country in peacetime. War, war, war is inevitable if you arm those foreign countries, and eventually the arms may be used against us.

You armed Russia to the tune of \$12,500,000,000 under lend-lease; you gave China over \$2,000,000,000 to arm themselves. Do you wish now we had not? Why is not that lesson enough? Do not let the President scare the American people to go along with such a scheme. Every Member of Congress who votes for it will surely rue the day. God save America; give us the spirit of brotherly love; help us to help ourselves and keep our nose out of foreigners' troubles and attend to our own business.

NATIONAL FARMERS' DAY

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a joint resolution requesting this Congress to authorize and designate a national day, emphasizing the importance of agriculture, to be known as Farmers' Day.

From time to time the Congress has authorized and set apart certain days of the year in commemoration of the birthday of some great person, or has designated certain days in commemoration of special events in the history of our Nation.

In 1894, the first Monday of September in each year was made a legal public holiday to be known as Labor's Holiday. While those who follow the pursuits of agriculture are laborers, the day has in actual practice come to be celebrated more by the industrial worker. The farmers of the Nation are glad that such day has been designated and they often join with their fellow workers in the celebration of this day.

The Legislature of the State of Alabama recently approved the following Senate joint resolution:

Whereas a well-balanced economic development of this Nation is essential to the present and prospective general welfare of all the people; and

Whereas the present and prospective development of a balanced economy demands the encouragement and development of all agricultural pursuits and enterprises; and

Whereas the continued development and well-being of the entire country depends on a sound agricultural program on parity with other pursuits; and

Whereas agricultural groups should have equal recognition and encouragement along with all other national groups and interests: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring)—

1. That the Congress is hereby respectfully urged to enact legislation looking to the establishment of a national day emphasizing the paramount importance of agriculture, to be known as Farmers' Day, in recognition of the importance of agriculture in a balanced national economy.

2. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of Agriculture, Speaker of the House of Representatives, President pro tempore of the Senate and to the Members of the Congress from Alabama.

Approved September 17, 1949.

While agriculture has always been the basic wealth of our Nation, its true importance has not been recognized by Congress and the Nation generally until the past few years. We all know and recognize that if this Nation is to be prosperous, that we must have a prosperous agriculture. A panic, or recession, is first felt in the agricultural sections of the Nation, and then certainly but surely it expands and extends to the industrial sections. When the farmer makes money, he freely spends it for goods manufactured in other parts of the Nation. A prosperous industrial sec-

tion cannot exist without a prosperous agricultural nation. When an unbiased history is written of the late war, it will give the farmer proper credit for the part that he played in the victory. This can be done without reflecting upon the great work done by others in the industrial sections.

While it is true that we could not have armed our fighters and those of our allies without the great records of production on the assembly lines which turned out jeeps, arms, airplanes, ships, and other munitions of war, at the same time these could not have been produced were it not for the fact that the farmers of the Nation were producing the food and fiber that were sent to the front and which was consumed by those in the industrial sections. This production, which was in ever mounting tonnage, was produced under great handicaps, because many young men from the farms were at the front, and old men, women, and children came to the rescue. There was a great shortage of fertilizer, farm equipment, and other necessities used by the farmers, but in spite of these handicaps and by hard work, they met the challenge by increased production.

So it is fitting and proper that some day during the year be set aside in order that the Nation may pay tribute to the tillers of the soil. The first Wednesday of each October is only a suggested day. It would be practically impossible to set aside any certain day in the year that would apply equally to all sections of the country; however, the early fall is generally the harvest season of the year. If anyone has other dates to suggest, I am sure that the committee to which this resolution is being referred will be glad to hear from them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

HON. ANTON MACIEJEWSKI

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the news of the untimely death of Hon. Anton Maciejewski on Sunday September 25 comes with a shocking suddenness, and brings grief and regret to all who were associated with him in the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses.

My sincere sympathy goes to his widow and to his family, and I think we all join in the sentiment that his life and character may be always a sustaining memory to them.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1949

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5895) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military as-

assistance to foreign nations, with amendment of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether this is the bill which was passed in the other body on Friday relative to the appropriation of \$1,400,000,000 to arm foreign nations?

Mr. KEE. This is the military-assistance bill.

Mr. RICH. What is going to be the attitude of the conferees on the part of the House so far as insisting on the amount which we voted for here? Or are we going to agree to give the other body their way in voting for \$1,400,000,000 for that purpose? It is just \$1,400,000,000 too much.

Mr. KEE. I can only speak for one conferee of the House, and I do not desire to comment on his attitude. And I could not possibly comment on the attitude of the other members.

Mr. RICH. I heard on the radio yesterday that one of the Members of the other body, who is a leader over there, said he is going to stick up for the full amount of \$1,400,000,000 to arm all these countries of the North Atlantic Pact and that is in the face of a statement made by the President that they have an atomic bomb now in Russia. If there is anything that would make a country use an atomic bomb on any other country, this bill that you are putting through is the very thing that will do it. It is inflaming all the world now. Instead of talking peace, peace, peace, you are going to get us into war, war, war, if you put this bill through. You ought to know better. The House of Representatives ought to know better. The Senate of the United States ought to know better. The President of the United States ought to know better. We ought to try to get peace in a peaceful way instead of trying to arm all the countries of the world. That surely means war. Mr. Speaker, it is wrong to pass such legislation as this. You know it. The President knows it, and so do all sensible thinking people. Yet you talk war and want peace.

In the name of good common sense, let us hold it up. Stop our arming the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to object to this bill going through. I want to know whether the conferees are going to pass this legislation and agree to this \$1,400,000,000. I do not want any more warmongering in this Nation of ours. You have been doing it too long.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I object. Let us stop it. Let us stop it now.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO NORFOLK COUNTY TRUST CO. IN STOUGHTON, MASS.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5356) to provide for the conveyance of land to the Norfolk County Trust Co. in Stoughton, Mass., with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "sell", insert: "at an appraised fair market value."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this Senate amendment provides that the Government shall get a fair value for the property, and I have no objection to that at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AID TO STATES IN FISH RESTORATION AND MANAGEMENT PROJECTS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate of the United States:

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 1746) entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the Senate is granted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include the monthly economic letter of the Northeast Foundation.

THE FISCAL SITUATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the Record the monthly economic letter to the Northeast Farm Foundation because it shows how the enormous spending that is going on in this country is affecting the ordinary citizen. I hope that everyone will read it. Unless we take it upon ourselves to hold back and reduce these appropriations that have been made and that are being proposed, the United States is going to run in the red for the fiscal year 1950 at least \$5,000,000,000. We cannot raise our taxes any higher than they are now. The burden upon the ordinary citizen is getting to the point where the deficit alone is running to the tune of \$35 a year for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It is about time that the Congress of the United States woke up and began to realize its responsibilities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2944), "An act to amend the

Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide survivorship benefits for widows or widowers of persons retiring under such act," for printing in the Record.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL FOR NEGRO VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6034) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. This is the Booker Washington Hospital bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say that the gentleman from Mississippi has conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts. The bill is a deserving one.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to acquire at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., a suitable site and erect thereon a hospital for Negro veterans.

Sec. 2. The sum of \$5,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose set forth in section 1 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in three separate instances.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a letter addressed by me to the Secretary of State and also his reply.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from West Virginia a question with reference to his request to send the Mutual Defense Assistance Act to conference. My reason for objecting as I did was to see if we could be sure that if the bill went to conference it would be brought back to the House with the chance for the House to agree or to object to the increase of the House amount for arming those countries, \$700,000,000, to \$1,400,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. What I want to do is to assure the House having a vote on that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that when request is made to send a bill to conference it is assumed that the conferees are going to meet in free conference. That is all you can expect. Last week we sent to conference several bills relating to the Committee on Appropriations of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member. The first principle of a conference between the two bodies is that it be

a free conference. Not only the gentleman from West Virginia, but all the conferees on the part of the House are going into that conference with free and open minds in an effort to adjust the differences which exist between the two branches.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the majority leader that I heard on the radio that some Senators were going to hold out for the full amount. If they make a public statement to the effect that they are going to insist on \$1,400,000,000, I want to know that it is assured that the House of Representatives will have an opportunity to say whether or not they will accept that amount.

Mr. McCORMACK. All I can say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is that neither he nor I are responsible for what somebody in the other body says. So far as this branch of Congress is concerned, we are going about things in an orderly way. The bill must first be taken from the Speaker's desk, the Senate amendments disagreed to, and the bill sent to conference. This can be done at this stage only by unanimous consent. The House conferees are going into conference with free and open minds. We are thus preserving the integrity of the House and the dignity of our position.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to harass the House nor do I want to make it difficult, but I want to emphasize my belief that we have got to stop this business of arming foreign countries. Such a course can react only to the detriment of America, and I want to save America; I do not want to do the thing that is going to wreck our country. I know that this legislation is just the kind of legislation that will wreck any country. When we arm the countries of Europe right near Russia, what do you think Russia has in mind? Suppose Russia aided in arming Cuba, Mexico, and some other countries close to America, what would we think? Your answer is the same as mine. We cannot do this; it is wrong and will only lead to war, increase our tax load, wreck us financially, and in every other way. Stop it, I say. Stop it now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia to extend his remarks and include the matter indicated?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PACT ACT OF 1949

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5895) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing military assistance to foreign nations, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I hope that the gentleman from West Virginia and the conferees will bring the bill back to the House in such shape as to give the House an opportunity to vote on the proposition of whether they are going to increase the amount the House voted, that is the sound thing to do. Let the votes of 435 Members determine that point, not 3 or 5 conferees

of our House. I will vote against increasing it for I voted against giving them anything to arm any European country. If we arm any let it be our own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. KEE, GORDON, RIBICOFF, EATON, and VORYS.

GULF-TO-LAKES SLACK WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a telegram, also a statement which I made before a Senate committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have a measure in conference which means more to the people of the Nation as a whole than anything else that has come up in recent years. I refer to the inland waterway known as the Tennessee-Tombigbee which will provide a slack water route from the Gulf of Mexico to the Great Lakes, by way of the Illinois River, as well as to Pittsburgh, Pa., by way of the Ohio, to St. Louis, Minneapolis, and St. Paul by way of the Mississippi, and to Kansas City, Omaha, and Sioux City by way of the Missouri.

It is very necessary for national defense. It will cut the water distance from the Gulf of Mexico, at Mobile, Ala., to Oak Ridge on the Tennessee River, where our atomic bomb plant is located, by 800 miles, and will cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf to Oak Ridge by about 75 percent, give us an additional water route from Oak Ridge to the sea, and contribute more to our national defense than any other project of its kind that has yet been proposed.

On Saturday last I received a long telegram from a man in Detroit, Mich., who is operating a barge line which hauls automobiles down to the Ohio River, and ships them by barge down the Ohio and the Mississippi to the Gulf, as well as into the Tennessee River, in which he says:

We are very much disturbed to learn that the Tombigbee project is not receiving full support.

Every month Commercial Barge Lines is transporting via Mississippi and Tennessee waterways upward of 15,000 Michigan-made automobiles along with other freight which goes by highway to Ohio River ports and thence by water to southern customers.

These Michigan manufacturers and their customers in the South have a real stake in the further economies which this waterway would provide and we sincerely hope you will lend your full support.

COMMERCIAL BARGE LINES, INC.,
F. CAREY, President.

From a standpoint of transportation, it will mean more to the States of Michigan, Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Pennsylvania, as well as to Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and all the other States in the West and South, than any other project of its kind that has ever been proposed.

It will provide them with a slack, or still, water route all the way up from the Gulf of Mexico, and at the same time

save the swift current of the Mississippi for downstream traffic.

In fact it will provide a downstream route on the Tennessee River from the point where this project intersects the Tennessee at or near the northern boundary of Mississippi and Alabama 215 miles to Paducah, Ky., on the Ohio River, and then 47 miles down the Ohio to Cairo, Ill.

The round trip from Cairo down to New Orleans, then across to Mobile along the intercoastal waterway, then up this slack water route to the Tennessee, then down that stream and the Ohio back to Cairo is 1,768 miles; of which 1,131 miles will be downstream and the rest of it in slack water.

The Army engineers say there is not another place on the face of the earth where such a project can be constructed—where they can transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances, to say nothing of its value for national defense.

The Senate has provided \$2,500,000 to begin work on this great project, and we are insisting that the House conferees accept the Senate provision.

We were told last year to wait until there was unemployment in that area before beginning this work.

That time has now arrived. Owing to the ravages of the boll weevil and the closing of the coal mines, that entire section, where this work is to be done, is faced with the worst condition of unemployment those people have known for more than 30 years.

We are appealing to the Congress to accept the Senate amendment.

I appeared before the Senate committee when this appropriation was being considered, and I am going to insert at this point the statement which I made then.

Remember that this project is already authorized by law. It is just as sure to be constructed as the world stands, and the sooner it is constructed the better it will be for the welfare of all our people and for the safety of the country.

My statement before the Senate committee follows:

Senator THOMAS. Congressman RANKIN.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN E. RANKIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

GENERAL STATEMENT ON TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE RIVERS PROJECT

Representative RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, in the beginning, let me say that I agree with the gentlemen who have spoken on the Coosa-Alabama project.

I also want to say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, Senator GURNEY, that I agree with him on the development of the Missouri Valley area. Recently, I checked up on that proposition, and found that the power that could be generated on the Missouri River and its tributaries would be a minimum of 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

Senator GURNEY. I do not know what the kilowatt-hours are, but the ultimate installed capacity is 1,400,000 kilowatts.

Representative RANKIN. I checked with the Federal Power Commission a day or two ago and was informed that the entire area would produce a minimum of at least 20,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power a year.

You measure your electricity that is used by the ultimate consumer, by the kilowatt-hour. That would be more than the Tennessee Valley Authority now produces. It produces about 15,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

Senator THOMAS. You multiply the amount of kilowatts first by 24, which gives the kilowatt-hours per day, then you multiply by 365 for the kilowatt-hours a year.

Representative RANKIN. If you want to run the day around, there are 8,760 hours, I believe, in a year. So a kilowatt running the entire year would amount to 8,760 kilowatt-hours.

When I came to Congress and I started in this fight in 1921, the people of this country used 37,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. Last year, 1948, we used 336,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. We now have 394,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydropower going to waste, every year, a large portion of which is in the Missouri Valley area.

I wish to express to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota my interest in that development, because that is more power than the people in the entire area are now using. I have those figures in my pocket. I could give them to you, State by State, but it is not necessary to take up the time of the committee for that purpose.

Senator GURNEY. Congressman RANKIN let me say that I have always been, since I have come to the Senate, a supporter of the north-bound channel of the barge line there that takes in Tombigbee. I feel that it is worth while.

AMOUNT REQUESTED

Representative RANKIN. I know that and I am grateful, Senator. I remember your support of it all through the years, and I remember your statements for it on the floor of the Senate.

Now, let me say to you in the beginning that the Army engineers say they would like to have \$5,000,000 to start this project now. I am not quoting anybody, individually, but that is what they say they would like to have to start with.

If this amendment is inserted in the Senate, I do not have the slightest doubt but that it will be retained in the House.

Let me show you where we are. I brought this map down to show you. You can see from those rivers there that it is almost a duplicate of this map except the lines are made heavier in order that you might more easily see what we have at stake.

Somebody said the other day that there is only a foot or two of water in this river. Where I am pointing is the confluence of Browns and Mackys Creeks, which join to form the Tombigbee about 25 miles from the Tennessee River. My father used to go to Walkers Ridge just below that point on a steamboat that came all the way from Mobile. There is a slight sand ridge between those two rivers, the Tennessee and the Tombigbee, and for more than a hundred years the Army engineers refused to approve this project, because they said they would have to have lifts both ways, and there was no water supply at the summit.

PICKWICK DAM

But in 1938, the Tennessee Valley Authority built the Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee just below the mouth of the Yellow Creek, and raised the water level 55 feet. The Army engineers made a new survey and came back and said that would solve the problem. They could cut through that sand ridge and put the summit of the project in the Tennessee River.

That would give us a slack or still water route for returning or upstream traffic to the Tennessee River, and a downstream route from that point 215 miles to Paducah on the Ohio River or 262 miles to Cairo on the Mississippi.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the Members may have these figures before them, I am inserting four tables here as part of my re-

marks, which show the savings this project will provide.

As I said, they have been worked out by the Army engineers, and can be thoroughly relied upon.

MULTIPLE PROJECT BENEFITS

Here is a table showing the cost per ton and the savings per ton this project will provide on the fuel bill alone, for upstream traffic:

Comparison of costs per ton of upstream traffic

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per ton	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per ton	Average savings per ton
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	\$2.02	\$1.32	\$0.70
	Paducah	2.10	1.26	.84
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	2.42	.99	1.43
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	2.39	.95	1.44
	Paducah	2.47	.89	1.58
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	2.79	.62	2.17
Fort Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	2.96	.95	2.01
	Paducah	3.04	.89	2.15
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.36	.62	2.74
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	2.68	.67	2.01
	Paducah	2.76	.61	2.15
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.08	.34	2.74
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	2.83	.51	2.32
	Paducah	2.91	.45	2.46
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.23	.17	3.06
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	2.88	.46	2.42
	Paducah	2.96	.40	2.56
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.28	.13	3.15
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	2.93	.41	2.52
	Paducah	3.01	.35	2.66
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	3.33	.08	3.25

Here is a table showing the cost and the savings on a barge load or tow of 3,500 tons.

I might say here, that except on the traffic

from the larger cities such as Pittsburgh, Chicago and Detroit, a majority of the traffic, at least until recently, was handled by these 3,500-ton tows.

Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 3,500 tons, and showing savings via Tennessee-Tombigbee

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 3,500 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	\$7,070	\$4,620	\$2,450
	Paducah	7,350	4,410	2,940
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	8,470	3,465	5,005
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	8,365	3,325	5,040
	Paducah	8,645	3,115	5,530
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	9,765	2,170	7,595
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	10,360	3,325	7,035
	Paducah	10,640	3,115	7,525
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,760	2,170	9,590
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	9,380	2,345	7,035
	Paducah	9,660	2,135	7,525
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	10,780	1,190	9,590
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	9,905	1,785	8,120
	Paducah	10,185	1,575	8,610
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,305	.595	10,710
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	10,080	1,610	8,470
	Paducah	10,360	1,400	8,960
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,480	.455	11,025
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	10,255	1,435	8,820
	Paducah	10,535	1,225	9,310
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	11,655	.280	11,375

Here is another table which the Army engineers have worked out showing the cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons, and the

savings which these barges would provide. As I pointed out, these larger barges are being used more and more as time goes on.

Showing cost per tow of barges carrying 14,000 tons and showing the savings via the Tennessee-Tombigbee

From—	To—	Cost via Mississippi per tow of 14,000 tons	Cost via Tennessee-Tombigbee per tow of 14,000 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
New Orleans, La.	Cairo	\$28,280	\$18,480	\$9,800
	Paducah	29,400	17,640	11,760
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	33,880	13,800	20,080
Mobile, Ala.	Cairo	33,460	13,300	20,160
	Paducah	34,580	12,460	22,120
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	39,060	8,680	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala.	Cairo	41,440	13,300	28,140
	Paducah	42,560	12,460	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	47,040	8,680	38,360
Demopolis, Ala.	Cairo	37,520	9,380	28,140
	Paducah	38,640	8,540	30,100
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	43,120	4,760	38,360
Columbus, Miss.	Cairo	39,620	7,140	32,480
	Paducah	40,740	6,300	34,440
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,220	2,380	42,840
Aberdeen, Miss.	Cairo	40,320	6,440	33,880
	Paducah	41,440	5,600	35,840
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	45,920	1,820	44,100
Fulton, Miss.	Cairo	41,020	5,740	35,280
	Paducah	42,140	4,900	37,240
	Tennessee-Tombigbee junction	46,620	1,120	45,500

Now let me show what all this means.

Let us take the river systems that are affected above this project. Just forget us local people for the time being. As I said to a man the other day, this project would be worth more in dollars and cents to Detroit, Mich., than to the district I represent. It will be worth far more in dollars and cents to Pittsburgh, Pa., or Cincinnati, Ohio, than to the district I represent. It will be worth far more in dollars and cents to the city of St. Louis or Chicago or Kansas City or Minneapolis or St. Paul or to Memphis or New Orleans than it will to the district I represent.

This bottleneck of our whole internal waterway system just happens to be in my district.

LOCKS AND DAMS

Now, there are 47 locks and dams on the Ohio River between Cairo and Pittsburgh. Then there are 13 locks and dams on the Monongahela and 8 on the Allegheny. All that traffic is simply stymied behind the swift current of the Mississippi River, so far as their returning, or north-bound traffic, is concerned.

In addition to that, on the upper Mississippi we have 26 locks and dams providing a splendid navigation channel all the way up to Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minn.

On the Illinois River we have seven locks and dams, extending our inland waterway system into the Great Lakes.

All those locks and dams together cost more than \$400,000,000, and yet they are virtually isolated for want of the very connection this project will provide.

On the Missouri River, a 9-foot channel is being developed up to Sioux City, Iowa. This project will be worth untold millions of dollars to the people of that area.

We get our grain from that section. The State of Mississippi, and I dare say the State of Alabama, raises no wheat. The same thing is true of Louisiana, Georgia, Tennessee, and all the other States in that part of the South.

They ship it down to us in barges. Those barges can come down the Mississippi flying, and so can these barges from Pittsburgh, Chicago, Minneapolis, and St. Paul; but when they start back here is the trouble. It is 869 miles from Cairo to New Orleans. That is the finest inland waterway in the world for downstream traffic, and the worst for upstream traffic.

You see, when that river is running $5\frac{1}{2}$ or 6 miles an hour your barges cannot move against it. All they can do is stand still and burn up gasoline. A barge only moves about $5\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour in still water. We have an intercoastal waterway protected by a chain of islands here, extending all the way from Florida to the Mexican line. It is 156 miles from New Orleans to Mobile along this intercoastal waterway—which, of course, is in slack or still water.

This Tombigbee inland waterway is already completed up to Demopolis, Ala., at the mouth of the Warrior River, where I am pointing on the map. Eighteen locks and dams are to be provided between Demopolis and the Tennessee River.

It will be 481 miles from Mobile up this Tombigbee route to the Tennessee River. That will be in still water, just as this is still water up the Ohio River behind those 47 locks and dams between Cairo, Ill., and Pittsburgh, Pa. When you get to the Tennessee River, it is downstream 262 miles to Cairo, Ill., or 215 miles to Paducah on the Ohio River.

So the traffic will come down the Mississippi River to New Orleans and then go across to Mobile along this intercoastal waterway, then back up inland waterway to the Tennessee River, then downstream to Paducah, that is the traffic going up to the Ohio River, or downstream to Cairo for the traffic going to the upper Mississippi, the Missouri, the Illinois, or the Great Lakes.

This project was unhesitatingly approved by the Ohio Valley Improvement Association of which Mr. Walter M. Larence, of Cincinnati, I believe, is the chairman. He was down here the other day. When the Rivers and Harbors Congress met here, Mr. Larence was on the committee, and they put at the head of the projects they recommended this Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

There is a firm in Pittsburgh that is engaged in the transportation business. They own a string of barges that come down the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers bringing materials produced in Pittsburgh, such as steel, farm machinery, and other manufactured products. When they go back they take oil, bauxite, sulfur, salt, lumber, cottonseed meal, and other materials they need.

This firm is tremendously interested, because they realize what it would mean for their returning traffic.

I am going to give you the figures on that in just a moment, but first I want to say one other thing.

Nobody need kid themselves; if we ever have another war, it is going to be fought with airplanes and atomic bombs. The greatest defense project the world has ever known is the Oak Ridge project on the Tennessee River. This inland waterway will cut the water distance between Oak Ridge and New Orleans by 650 miles, and between Oak Ridge and Mobile by 806 miles, and at the same time give us two outlets to the sea instead of one.

In addition to that, it will give us slack-water route into the Tennessee River and cut the cost of transportation from the Gulf to the Tennessee by more than 75 percent or from \$2.79 to 62 cents a ton.

Now, I am going to take some of the barges they handle here, the big ones, because they are drifting rapidly toward the use of 14,000-ton barges. However, I am going to insert some tables showing the savings on smaller loads also.

DISTANCES INVOLVED

Senator STENNIS. Before you leave that, will you retrace your route there from Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans and back to Cairo, and give us that mileage?

Representative RANKIN. Yes; let's take the traffic going downstream from Cairo, Ill. We will say a barge comes down the Missouri River, or down the upper Mississippi, or down the Illinois River, or down the Ohio River. They all come through Cairo.

Going from Cairo to New Orleans, you go downstream 869 miles. That is said to be the finest inland waterway on earth; and I think is so. I have never found one to equal it.

Then it is 156 miles across along the intercoastal waterway from New Orleans to Mobile. If I make a mistake, I want Colonel Jewett, the Army engineer who is sitting near me, to correct me. I do not want to mislead the committee.

It is 481 miles from Mobile to the Tennessee River, of which portion 221 is already developed up to the mouth of the Warrior River at Demopolis.

When you get to the Tennessee River it is 215 miles downstream to Paducah on the Ohio, and 47 miles from Paducah down the Ohio River to Cairo.

In other words, the round trip is 1,768 miles. Of that 1,768 miles, 1,131 or approximately two-thirds of it is downstream, and the rest of it is in slack water. The Army engineers tell me—and I am quoting every engineer that has studied this question from General Reybold, General Feringa, General Wheeler, to our distinguished company here today, Colonel Jewett—they tell there is not another place on the face of the earth, nor can they find a place on the face of the earth where a project of this kind can be constructed so that you can transfer the traffic from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and

such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances.

Some fellow up in the House got up and said, "My God, JOHN RANKIN is the only man on earth that could have found a project that would be downstream both ways."

But I did not make this project. I did not build these rivers. De Soto discovered the upper Tennessee River more than 400 years ago. He came down it to where Gunter'sville now stands. He left it there and went down to Tuscaloosa, got into a fight with the Indians and came back across to the site of the present city of Memphis.

He thought it was the same stream. De Soto's map shows the Tennessee River curving southward and making the Mississippi. I have a copy of his map in my files now.

Now let us see what this project will mean. Let us take the 14,000-ton barges. Here is one [pointing to the picture on the map] coming down from Detroit, Mich. It is loaded with automobiles and accessories. It is evidently coming from Detroit. It is coming out of the Great Lakes down the Illinois River.

Here is one coming from Pittsburgh, Pa., loaded with the manufactured products of Pittsburgh.

Here is one over here that is coming, I believe, down the Missouri. I do not know what it is loaded with; probably with grain or beef or other products that those people out in that area produce.

Suppose that 14,000-ton barge gets to New Orleans; what does it cost to go back? If it goes back by way of the Mississippi River to Cairo, it will cost \$28,280, for its fuel bill alone.

Going back via Tombigbee and the Tennessee to Cairo the cost would be \$18,480, or a saving of \$9,800 on its fuel bill alone.

Senator GURNEY. That is about one-third. Representative RANKIN. That is about right.

Suppose it is going back to Pittsburgh or to Cincinnati or Wheeling or to any point on the Susquehanna or the Monongahela it would cut the cost from \$29,400 to \$17,640, saving \$11,760 on its fuel bill alone going back to any point on the Ohio River, or its tributaries.

Suppose it is going into the Tennessee; suppose we are in an emergency and it is going back to Oak Ridge, on the Tennessee River; it will cut the cost from \$33,880 to \$13,860, or a saving of \$20,020, on the fuel bill alone. That is from New Orleans.

Every 14,000-ton barge that goes into the Tennessee River from New Orleans via this route would save \$20,020 on its fuel bill alone, or two-thirds, as Senator GURNEY said.

Suppose it is going from Mobile, carrying a load of that bauxite, we will say, that they are bringing in from South America, or salt or lumber or cottonseed meal, hulls, anything that they take back in those barges; going back from Mobile to Cairo, the cost would be reduced from \$33,460 to \$13,300 just on the fuel bill alone, a saving of \$20,160.

Now, that means every barge that is going, not only to Cairo, but to Chicago, any point on the Great Lakes, or the upper Mississippi, all the way up to Minneapolis, St. Paul, anywhere up the Missouri River to Sioux City, Iowa.

Suppose it is going the other way. We will say that it is going to Pittsburgh, Pa.

The fuel bill would be cut from \$34,580 to \$12,460, or \$22,120. That could be the saving on its fuel bill alone. That is a 14,000-ton barge going from Mobile all the way up to Pittsburgh, or to any other point on the Ohio or any of its tributaries.

Suppose it is going into the Tennessee River; your cost would be cut from \$39,060 down to \$8,680, or a saving of \$30,380 on its fuel bill alone. That is for material, we will say, that is going to supply our defense plant at Oak Ridge or any other point on the Tennessee River.

Now, let us go a little further. We have this Tombigbee developed up to Demopolis. I want to say, too, that one of these things these barges takes back is oil. A man from Pittsburgh, talking to me the other day, said, "We are hauling this machinery and other manufactured articles down. We are hauling oil back."

One of the biggest oil fields that has been discovered in recent years is just to the west of Demopolis, Ala. The biggest oil well ever brought in east of the Mississippi River was in Jasper County, Miss., about where I am pointing at this time. It produced a thousand barrels of oil a day, and I am told that no other well has ever been brought in east of the Mississippi that produced that amount.

By the way, this is the saving that the Birmingham traffic would enjoy, because every vessel from Birmingham has to come down the Warrior to Demopolis to go either way. These things I am referring to will apply to traffic going from Birmingham or Demopolis. Let us see what they amount to.

Going from Demopolis to Cairo, the cost will be cut from \$37,520 on one of these 14,000-ton barges to \$9,380, or a saving of \$28,140 on its fuel bill alone.

In other words, that barge going back to Detroit, Mich., would save \$28,140 on its fuel bill alone. That barge going to Pittsburgh would save \$34,440, or have its fuel bill cut from \$40,740 to \$6,300, a saving, as I said, of \$34,440.

These figures are worked out by the Army engineers; they are not my figures.

If it were going into the Tennessee, supplying oil or other materials, we will say to the Oak Ridge project, the cost would be cut from \$43,120 to \$4,760, or a saving of \$38,360 on its fuel bill alone.

Now, you talk about water development, traffic-transportation development, but nowhere else on earth can the same amount of money bring the same benefits to the people of this vast area, all the Missouri River Valley, all the way up the Mississippi River, all the way up the Illinois into the Great Lakes and along the Great Lakes, all the way up the Ohio River to Cincinnati, Wheeling, Pittsburgh, and up the Monongahela or the Allegheny, and then along the Tennessee River all the way up to Oak Ridge or to Knoxville. There is not another project on earth, and there cannot be one found or constructed that will produce such benefits. The nearest we have ever found was a connection between the Don and Volga in Russia, and it does not have the benefit of the downstream traffic both ways for two-thirds of the distance.

The Senator from South Dakota asked what would happen to it if it went back to the House. I do not have the slightest doubt but that the House will sustain it. I have talked to many Members since this bill was up before. They say that, if the Senate gives us an appropriation for this project, it will be sustained in the House.

All we are asking is that you give us a reasonable amount. I would like to see you provide 5 or 10 million dollars. I think we ought to have that amount. The Army engineers could start with a smaller amount.

But I think it is imperative that we construct this project now as rapidly as possible.

ESTIMATED TOTAL COST

Senator THOMAS. What will it cost, all told?

Representative RANKIN. The latest estimate I see is \$116,000,000. Someone said that the advance in the cost of labor and also the advanced cost of materials would probably run it up to \$136,000,000 all told.

By the way, they would employ 5,000 people, and we seem to be heading into unemployment in this country, in every section of it.

Senator ELLENDER. What size channel is that?

Representative RANKIN. Nine-foot channel with a 12-foot base, you understand, in the

locks, so that if you want to increase it to 12, that could be done.

Senator ELLENDER. According to the figures you have just given us, I would assume that if goods are to be sent from Pittsburgh to Mobile, it would be more profitable to go by way of New Orleans.

Representative RANKIN. That is right.

Senator ELLENDER. Although there is about 200 miles difference.

Representative RANKIN. You can go from Pittsburgh to New Orleans without spending a nickel, if you go with the current, and that current is pretty fast after you reach the Mississippi. That stream sometimes runs 6 or 7 miles an hour. That traffic would go down the river, down the Mississippi River to New Orleans, and then it would go back through this slack-water route. In other words, the traffic would move counterclockwise.

Senator ELLENDER. You said there are several locks up there?

Representative RANKIN. Eighteen locks and dams between Demopolis and the Tennessee River.

PROPOSED CHANNEL WIDTH

Senator THOMAS. How wide would the channel be?

Representative RANKIN. I believe it is 170 feet.

Senator STENNIS. Is that large enough to take care of all normal traffic?

Representative RANKIN. Yes.

By the way, when this project was first before the Senate and the House, they recommended locks 75 feet long and 475 feet wide, and there was a good deal of complaint about it by people along the Ohio and the Illinois and the upper Mississippi for the simple reason that all the locks on those streams, and the locks at Pickwick and at Gilbertsville on the lower Tennessee, are 110 by 600 feet. So the Army engineers went back, made a new survey at the request of the Members of the House, and they have made these locks all 110 by 600 feet, so that they will carry all the traffic that can travel any of the rest of these streams.

Senator GURNEY. The only difference we would be short if we approved this \$136,000,000 project would be the difference between the 9-foot and 12-foot channel. We would later have to deepen it to 12 feet probably.

Representative RANKIN. We might do it, but we could do it; there would be no trouble about that.

The project has already been approved. It was approved in the Senate by a vote of 44 to 21 and by the House by a good majority, in 1946.

It is already written into the law.

Senator GURNEY. For a 9-foot or 12-foot channel?

Representative RANKIN. Nine foot with 12 feet over the sills so it can be deepened to 12 feet if necessary. That will put it as deep as the current stream along the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Illinois, and the intercoastal canal.

As I said, we people in my district will probably get less benefit out of it than St. Louis, Pittsburgh, Memphis, New Orleans, Chicago, Minneapolis, or St. Paul. It will not only benefit all these areas here along these streams that are now seeking an outlet; the people on the Ohio River during last year or 2 years ago had a mass meeting to figure out some way to get an outlet to the sea.

Well, this will provide exactly what they are seeking.

Senator STENNIS. Will this 9-foot channel take care of all these barges about which you are talking?

Representative RANKIN. Yes; it will take care of every one of them.

Then, in addition to that, it will take care of all this traffic along the Great Lakes from Detroit and Cleveland. In addition to that, it will take care of the traffic along the Gulf of Mexico from Florida clear around to the

border of Mexico. We have that Intra-coastal Waterway that is protected behind a string of submerged islands, and these barges can go down and go either way. It simply completes the missing link in the greatest inland waterway system in the world.

I want to thank the committee for your kindness. I do not want to take up all your time. You have been very generous. We have some more gentlemen here who would like to be heard.

Senator ELLENDER. It has been most interesting.

Representative RANKIN. Thank you, Senator.

I do want to say this. The last time I discussed this project with the President, he said, "John, I am just as much interested in that project as you are."

Thank you.

Senator THOMAS. Thank you, Congressman RANKIN.

The Senate committee recommended, and the Senate approved, an amendment providing \$2,500,000 to begin this work.

We are appealing to the Members of the House to approve this amendment, in order that we may get started on the construction of this, the greatest project of its kind on earth, and one that means more to the people throughout the great Mississippi Valley—from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Brownsville, Tex.; from New Orleans, La., to Minneapolis and St. Paul; from Mobile, Ala., to Chicago, Ill.; and from Pensacola, Fla., to Sioux City, Iowa—than anything else that could be done at this time.

One that will go a long way toward relieving the distress which unemployment is bringing to that section of the country where this project is to be constructed, and one that will contribute greatly to our national defense by providing an additional, short, slack-water route from the Gulf of Mexico to our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn.

This is an all-American project and one that will benefit all the American people.

Let us begin its construction at the earliest possible moment.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, in the light of world-shaking events which have recently transpired the issue which I intend to bring before this House today may not seem to you to be of great importance but I can assure you that millions of people in the United States and throughout the world do consider it of great significance. I refer to the diplomatic status of the representation of Ireland in this country and of the United States in Ireland. How is it that countries like Afghanistan, Pakistan, Honduras, Costa Rica and Nicaragua and 40 or more smaller countries have ambassadorial status here and we have Embassies in their countries and yet we have only a legation in Ireland and they have only a legation here? Now facts and figures bear out that the number of Americans who were born in Ireland and the number of Americans of Irish descent is vastly greater than those Americans or descent from any one or from all of these

countries and I feel that it is high time that we looked into what appears to be discrimination and have the situation corrected. Bear in mind that we have in this country 13,500,000 people whose grandparents were born in Ireland. We have in the United States over 30,000,000 people with some Irish blood. There are in this country more than 270,000 people natives of Ireland. When you add to these population figures the indisputable historical facts concerning the tremendous contribution made by the Irish people to the establishment of our independence and to our growth to the world's foremost power we cannot but realize that we Americans owe a debt of gratitude to the Irish—and it is time that we recognized it. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, let us not forget that approximately 40 percent of the American Revolutionary Army was composed of Irish immigrants. They not only swelled the ranks but they led the ranks and no fewer than 19 generals in the Continental Army were of Irish birth or blood. The first armed attack for American independence on land was made by Maj. Gen. John Sullivan who stormed Fort William and Mary and captured British armaments which were used by our forces at the Battle of Bunker Hill. It was Jeremiah O'Brien who started the hostilities at sea when he and his five stalwart sons leading a band of neighboring patriots put out to sea in their fishing boats, boarded and captured the English warship *Margaretta*. An infuriated English admiral dispatched two vessels to recapture the *Margaretta*. The O'Briens gave battle and succeeded in capturing the two British warships which were sent out to capture them. And gentlemen, no American can ever forget that the father of the American Navy, Commodore John Barry, commanded the American battleship, the *Lexington*, the first officially commissioned American fighting ship in the Revolutionary War. It is no wonder then that Lord Mountjoy arose before the English Parliament to explain the cause of England's defeat in these remarkable words:

America was lost by Irish emigrants.

I should not have to tell you of the great, the rich, the important contribution made to American democracy by Irish immigrants and by men and women of Irish descent from all walks of life—in the military, in education, in science, in labor, in business and in the professions. Ten Irishmen were signers of the Declaration of Independence and the American Presidents of Irish descent were Andrew Jackson, James Polk, James Buchanan, and Woodrow Wilson. Stonewall Jackson, master strategist of the Confederate Armies, was of Irish descent as were Generals Sheridan and Meade of the Northern Army. Cyrus McCormick, who invented the harvesting machine, and Samuel Morse, who developed modern telegraphy, were Irish. Robert Fulton, whose father came from Kilkenny, developed steam navigation. John R. Holland was the inventor of the submarine.

My fellow Members, if there is any nation in the world deserving of sovereignty it is the Irish Nation: But I wish

to point out that no country can enjoy complete sovereignty if within its borders there is a foreign power occupying territory and maintaining military establishments.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to offer two resolutions before this session is over: First, to raise the status of United States representation in Ireland to that of an Embassy, and the other to have this House memorialize the British Parliament to end the partition of Ireland.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, one of America's foremost Americans of Irish descent.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania with regard to the ambassadorial status that on September 1, 1949, I addressed a letter to Secretary of State Acheson, and that I inserted it in the RECORD today, and it will appear in the Appendix. There are only a few countries that do not have ambassadorial status. Siam and a lot of other countries have ambassadorial status. It seems to me upon the facts that our country should immediately take action to elevate our diplomatic relationship with Ireland to ambassadorial status. There are only a few countries left without ambassadorial status, and they might well be given consideration. I assume the gentleman has a list of those countries that do have ambassadorial status and those that do not. Some of the countries with which our relationship is now that of a Minister are greater in population and power and influence in world affairs than some of those that have ambassadorial status. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman, and I think that should be done as quickly as possible.

On the partition question, the serious mistake made there was that the British Parliament passed a law that the people of the northern counties could themselves not pass upon the question of whether or not they wanted partition. They took that power away from the people and left it only to the Parliament of what are known as the Ulster counties. The British Parliament itself did that, which, to me, seems to be a grave injustice.

As to the ambassadorial status, that is something which rests exclusively within the control of our country, and it should be taken care of at once.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts. He has said everything I could have said on this issue with much greater clarity than I could have expressed it. I now propose to speak on my second resolution. Partition is the sole remaining issue between Ireland and her neighboring Isle. Its solution would end the century-old struggle that the Irish people have waged for liberty and self-determination. It is obvious that, by bringing about a solution of this question, the United States would render a service not merely to Ireland and Britain but to the world democracy.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I was just wondering why we should pass any resolution here trying to tell Britain or Ireland what kind of a government they should have.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I am not trying to tell England what kind of a government they should have. We are approaching this in a most friendly manner. If you read the New York Times of yesterday you might have seen there an editorial that England has to do a big selling job in order to keep up the volume of its exports because of the devaluation of the pound. Now, the best selling job that England could do in America, with millions and millions of Americans of Irish descent, if they want to build up acceptance of their trade here, is to end the partition of Ireland now.

Mr. RICH. I would like to say to the gentleman that I am not here defending England—God forbid—because England is pulling the wool over our eyes now more than she has ever before. They are taking our dollars from us so fast that after a while there will not be any left.

Mr. DAVENPORT. The gentleman is using up my time. Let us go on with the question of partition of Ireland.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the gentleman is certainly an eloquent champion of the descendants of the great Irish people and of the country of Ireland. I am certain the Members of the House are enjoying his talk this morning very, very much. It will give them cause for a good deal of thought and consideration.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I know that he is a staunch friend of Ireland and will do everything in his power to end the partition of the Irish Republic. And now Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal to Britain to take action to undo the partition of Ireland. So that the world may know that they acknowledge that the principle on which they call upon the Cominform to abandon aggression, shall rule their own actions. If the unification of the country were to be brought about, the Irish people would wholeheartedly and enthusiastically cooperate with the other great democratic nations in their efforts to support and defend the ideals for which they all stand. On the strategic side it is indisputable that Ireland, the last outpost of Europe and the nearest bastion of Europe to America, could best be used as a base for the defense of western Europe against aggression as a unit. A divided Ireland, containing in the partitioned area hundreds of thousands of persons detesting the regime under which they are forced to live, would constitute a grave danger to the successful operations of the military command there.

The essence of democratic rule lies in the right of the people of a nation to determine democratically by their free votes, their form of government and their internal affairs, without outside interference. It was the infringement of this rule which was largely responsible for the last war and which is now responsible for much of the tension existing in Europe today. Interference in the affairs of another nation, whether it be by Germany, Russia, or by Britain, is destructive of the

basis upon which democratic government rests and must lead to friction.

The Irish people should be allowed to determine their own affairs democratically and of their own free will, without interference by Britain. The fact that Britain succeeded, over 25 years ago, in retaining a corner of the island and that she has since occupied it, in no way entitled her to divide the historic Irish nation and to pretend that the island now consists of two separate nations.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, as I said before, I would like to see the United States representation in Ireland raised to the rank of an embassy and that the first ambassador be accredited to a United Ireland from our United States. I wish to conclude with a poem written by one of the finest of all American poets, a man of Irish descent, John Boyle O'Reilly:

No treason we bring from Erin—nor bring
we shame nor guilt!
The sword we hold may be broken, but we
have not dropped the hilt!
The wreath we bear to Columbia is twisted
of thorns, not bays:
And the songs we sing are saddened by
thoughts of desolate days.
But the hearts we bring for freedom are
washed in the surge of tears:
And we claim our rights by a people's fight
outliving a thousand years.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman on his very eloquent, very effective, and very convincing statement. I heartily agree with him. I think our representation should be raised to ambassador at once.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They should have an ambassador. The Irish have made a very great contribution.

Mr. DAVENPORT. That will be the first step toward ending the partition which will always be a thorn in the side of democracy all over the world. I fought for the fulfillment of the partition of Palestine to guarantee a free and independent Israel. Let us do the same thing for Ireland.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, favor any movement which will bring about the abolition of partition because I am sure it is the only existing cause for friction between Ireland and Great Britain.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I congratulate the gentleman. I believe he has brought up a very vital and very important matter. The State Department of the United States should take serious note of his statement in the House today. There is no country in the world more entitled to this status than Ireland. And

furthermore, I have stated in the House and I repeat that I favor a definite and a complete separation of all of Ireland and Great Britain. And I heartily agree with my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT], that the contribution of Americans of Irish descent to our democracy, our culture, and to our national welfare is deserving enough of our gratitude for the United States to take an active part in furthering the cause that would end the unjust partition of Ireland.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the distinguished Representative from Nebraska.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I wish to commend the distinguished gentleman on his timely and well-considered remarks. The splendid sincerity manifested by you in making your remarks made a deep impression upon me and I am sure all of your other colleagues. You have caused everyone with a drop of Irish blood in their veins, and there are millions of them in the United States of America, to remember the land of their ancestry. It might not be amiss for all of us to recite here and take to heart again the great poem of Thomas Moore, *Remember Thee*, which is as follows:

Remember thee! Yes, while there's life in
this heart,
It shall never forget thee, all lorn as thou
art;
More dear in thy sorrow, thy gloom, and
thy showers,
Than the rest of the world in their sun-
niest hours.
Wert thou all that I wish thee, great, glori-
ous, and free,
First flower of the earth, and first gem of
the sea,
I might hail thee with prouder, with hap-
pier brow,
But, oh! Could I love thee more deeply
than now?
No, thy chains as they rankle, thy blood as
it runs,
But makes thee more painfully dear to
thy sons—
Whose hearts, like the young of the desert-
bird's nest,
Drink love in each life-drop that flows
from thy breast.

I feel that this is the time when the land of saints and scholars should also have an ambassador. If Haiti and other countries of similar standing are accorded that right, then certainly we are wrong in not granting an ambassadorship to Ireland. The matter of world recognition of a united Ireland concerning which the gentleman spoke, also arose during the time of President Wilson, when the promise was made that small nations were to be recognized, and were to be accorded self-government, but the Irish delegation was never received by President Wilson at all and that fact cast a pretty baleful shadow over his political future, I assure you, and helped his memory sink almost into oblivion.

I received a telegram the other day wherein a party suggested that we should accept the Dominion of Canada from England to pay the war debts she owes to us. I immediately replied and told him what I thought we ought to do was

to take the northern counties of Ireland, which are being kept from united Ireland, in payment of the war debts, and then give the counties forthwith back to Ireland and everyone would get along much better and be happier I am sure.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I thank the eloquent gentleman from Nebraska. This has been a great day for the Irish cause in this House. Let us keep up the good fight until we win a sure victory for the cause of democracy and the end of the partition of Ireland so that she may take her rightful place among the great democratic nations of the earth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

AIRCRAFT CARRIERS AND THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, before President Truman made the announcement, many persons in the United States believed that Russia had the know-how of the atomic bomb. I think many felt that the United States was very careless in allowing the number of persons into our country which they did to study our war-production methods. But that is past history. I rise today to ask the Congress if they will not reconsider and authorize the building of the big carrier, the production of which was stopped sometime ago. I would favor not only the building of the one carrier which was authorized, but I would authorize the building of two carriers. How can we take any chances? It is only recently that some of the armed forces, so far as I can tell, have come to the realization that a very large percentage of the earth's surface consists of water.

Certainly none of the armed forces has anything yet that can or will take the place of the carrier. When you consider the carrier is two or three times the length of an ordinary football field, you realize the tremendous extent of it, and you realize the number of planes that can take off from that carrier.

Do you not believe, as I do, that Russia would hesitate a great deal to use the atom bomb if she felt that we had numerous carriers of those dimensions? I do not believe Russia would be so reckless in throwing her atom bombs if she realized how many she would have to throw and how effective those airplane carriers could be.

That leads me to another point, Mr. Speaker, and that is the rather horrible fear that many have and which those in the Navy have in raising their voices against scrapping of our Navy. Those in the Navy and elsewhere are afraid of reprisals. Already there have been many reprisals against those who had the courage to speak. I talked to Secretary Knox and other high-ranking naval officials before Pearl Harbor, several times, about the plight of the Navy then, and what I considered was the danger. After Pearl Harbor, Secretary Knox and also those high-ranking naval officers talked with me, and one of them said, "I am deeply humiliated."

I know Secretary Forrestal was very anxious about Russia. I talked with him

many times about national defense. He spoke of his fear of Russia. I believe Mr. Forrestal died largely of a broken heart because he felt that the Navy was being dangerously weakened.

What can we do without our United States Navy? America has been asleep. It was asleep after the First World War, and I believe America is asleep today. We like to fool ourselves. We like to lull ourselves into a sense of false security. What is it if we do waste the money for one or two additional carriers? We had much better take a chance of wasting a few dollars than to weaken our national defense.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does the gentlewoman think that the Russian Navy is any match for the English Navy today?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think Russia is very strong in her submarines, and is generally considered so. But we do not want to give Russia a chance to develop her Navy. Certainly every means should be taken to stop her using the atom bomb.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am in accord with the gentlewoman's statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. SHORT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for an indefinite period, on account of official business in district.

To Mr. BLAND (at the request of Mr. GARY) for an indefinite period, on account of illness of himself and in his family.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1453. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1976. An act to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.;

H. R. 3616. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lulu Two Spears Iron Bird;

H. R. 3886. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jeanette Pearl Burns;

H. R. 5310. An act to confer jurisdiction on the State of California over the lands and residents of the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation in said State, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5670. An act authorizing transfer of land to the county of Bernalillo, State of New Mexico, for a hospital site.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

940. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend sections 7, 8, 9, and 12 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and sections 388 (a) and 392 (a) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

941. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

942. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the apprehension and detention of insane persons in the District of Columbia, and providing for their temporary commitment in the Government Hospital for the Insane, and for other purposes,' approved April 27, 1904, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

943. A letter from the executive assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States military forces at certain public airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

944. A letter from the Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a consolidated report on additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

945. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report of settlement of debts due Farmers Home Administration in excess of \$1,000 which have been settled during the fiscal year 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture.

946. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 and prior fiscal years in the amount of \$5,373,057.31 and contract authorization in the amount of \$8,000,000, together with certain proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

947. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to make cancer and all malignant neoplastic diseases reportable to the Health Officer of the District of Columbia," to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

948. A letter from F. B. Pareja, provincial assessor, Province of Cebu, Republic of the Philippines, transmitting a letter informing the Congress of certain services he rendered to the war internees during the occupation

of the Philippines by the Japanese; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee of conference. H. R. 2944. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide survivorship benefits for widows or widowers of persons retiring under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 1339). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6209. A bill to authorize the commutation of the annual appropriation for fulfilling various treaties with the Choctaw Nation of Indians in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 6210. A bill to continue in effect to June 30, 1950, certain priorities and preferences relating to disposal of surplus real estate at Camp Butner, N. C.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 6211. A bill amending Public Law No. 106, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 6212. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6213. A bill to authorize reimbursement to the appropriations of the Bureau of Narcotics of moneys expended for the purchase of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 6214. A bill authorizing the adjustment of contracts for the sale of timber on the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6215. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at a location to be selected by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6216. A bill amending Public Law No. 106, Seventy-ninth Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6217. A bill to provide greater security for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and Philippine Insurrection, in the granting of out-patient treatment by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 6218. A bill to provide that the 7th day of December in each year is to be a legal holiday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 6219. A bill to provide that the loyalty review board shall conduct its proceedings in accordance with the rules of evidence prescribed in the Federal rules of criminal procedure; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6220. A bill to provide that loyalty adjudication proceedings under Executive

Order 9835 shall be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence prescribed in the Federal rules of criminal procedure; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. J. Res. 354. Joint resolution designating Farmers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H. J. Res. 355. Joint resolution to alleviate suffering and assist in reconstruction of earthquake-devastated areas in Ecuador; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 364. Resolution providing that funds made available out of the contingent fund of the House by House Resolutions 88, 127, and 252 to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments shall also be available for expenses incurred outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. Res. 365. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of the government of organizations dealing with labor; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 103, a joint resolution urging the enactment of legislation establishing a national day emphasizing the paramount importance of agriculture, to be known as Farmers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6221. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the This-Side-of-Heaven Children's Home for use as a children's home; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 6222. A bill for the relief of R. J. Scheuerman, Daniel Fuller, W. Hardesty, and John M. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 6223. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent resident of James Ermini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6224. A bill for the relief of Mozart Rottman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 6225. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Aimee Hoyninger-Huene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 6226. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nora Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6227. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Eugenios Christofalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6228. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chao-Jen Chen, Dr. Janet Wang Chen, Eleanor Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6229. A bill for the relief of Luis Eduardo Equizabal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1499. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of Norman L. Bass, of Hoisington, Kans., and others, requesting that Congress take further steps to curtail communism and to increase under the world recovery plan the shipping of agricultural products, food, and clothing to all needy and Christian countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1500. By Mr. DOYLE: Petition signed by Mrs. C. D. Rasmussen, together with 42 residents of Long Beach, Calif., requesting passage of the bill H. R. 2428 (S. 1847) to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1501. By Mr. RICH: Petition of McKean County (Pa.) Medical Society, urging the Congress of the United States to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of the Nation any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of medical care designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1502. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution adopted by the Columbian Federation of New Britain, Conn., consisting of 35 Italian-American societies and clubs with a membership of 15,000 Italo-American citizens, urging support in the final disposition of Italian colonies by returning the former colonies to Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1503. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. Chambers and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1504. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1505. Also, petition of Bertha Miller and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1506. Also, petition of W. T. Winter and others, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1507. Also, petition of Mrs. John Linserman and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1949

(Legislative day of Saturday, September 3, 1949)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, bowing for a hallowed moment at this shrine of Thy grace we acknowledge before Thee that our lives are like restless pools. We are disturbed by the social turmoil of our times, burdened by many anxieties, tempted to cynicism by human cruelty

and tyranny, often disheartened by human folly which seems to profit so little by bitter reaping. We would lay our problems and tasks before Thee, not to escape them but praying for Thy empowering so that with strength and courage we may carry them with a new gallantry. In a divided and violent world make us among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed, because our records shall write our names among today's peacemakers. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CONNALLY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 26, 1949, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6034) to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. FERGUSON, and by unanimous consent, Mr. VANDENBERG was granted indefinite leave of absence.

NOMINATION OF W. WALTON BUTTERWORTH TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of W. Walton Butterworth to be Assistant Secretary of State? Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time between now and 1 o'clock is divided equally, to be controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I shall vote against the confirmation of W. Walton Butterworth to be an Assistant Secretary of State of the United States.

By the nomination of Mr. Butterworth, the President of the United States and those who advise him regarding the men who should direct our relations with the other nations of the world stubbornly continue to darken the pages of American diplomacy.

I refer, Mr. President, to the complete failure of American diplomacy in China.

I refer, Mr. President, to the inescapable truth that the Government of the United States must shamefully but forthrightly plead guilty to much of the blame for the tragic fact that China is today largely Communist controlled.

It would take hours to relate the whole China story and our Government's vacillating role in it. I do not attempt to relate the whole story but only a few of the high lights with Mr. Butterworth's significant association with them.